

published monthly since 1866

he

Fortnightly

FOUNDED IN 1865 BY ANTHONY TROLLOPE

AUGUST, 1954

MLII N.S.

Illinois U Library

CONTENTS

HOW WIDE IS THE ATLANTIC ?

AMERICAN POLICY IN SOUTH-EAST ASIA

C. NORTHCOTE PARKINSON

THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY IN 1954—Part II.

ASA BRIGGS

THE COMMONWEALTH IN A DIVIDED WORLD

JOHN BIGGS-DAVISON

NATIVE WELFARE IN SOUTH AFRICA

JOHN MOSS

THE CIVIL WAR BE AVOIDED ?—*Contemporary Opinions XVII*—Part II.

THE ATTACK ON MONOPOLY

W. T. WELLS, M.P.

FRANK MORLEY IN POLITICS

M. R. D. FOOT

THE INWARD EYE—*Radio Listening* : 2

NORMAN NICHOLSON

THE ARCHAEOLOGISTS and WEATHERCOCK—*Two Poems*

MARGARET STANLEY-WRENCH

FRENCH FARMERS IN COURT

LEN, ORTZEN

Correspondence—India's Foreign Policy

The Fortnightly Library :

ENBRUGH AND HAWKSMOOR

F. W. WENTWORTH-SHEILDS

Other Contributors—David Thomson, W. Thomson Hill, S. Reed Brett, C. Plowright. J. F. Burnet, Joshua C. Gregory, G. W. Horner, Loveday Martin, Grace Banyard.

3s. 6d. or

LA. 55 CENTS

CANADA 60 CENTS

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

42s. PER ANNUM or

U.S.A. \$6.50

CANADA \$7.00

ALL CLASSES

OF INSURANCE

TRANSACTED

CAR & GENERAL

INSURANCE CORPORATION LIMITED

83, PALL MALL, LONDON, S.W.1

THE FORTNIGHTLY

was founded as an independent review in 1865 by the novelist, Anthony Trollope. Under its great editor, the historian and political philosopher John Morley, it maintained its traditional independence, offering an arena for the discussion of burning questions—political, social, religious and literary. That independence is maintained to-day. The Fortnightly is connected with no other group or publication. It owes allegiance to no single party or political interest. It is edited for those who need to be well informed.

AUGUST 1954

	PAGE
HOW WIDE IS THE ATLANTIC?	73
AMERICAN POLICY IN SOUTH-EAST ASIA. BY C. NORTHCOTE PARKINSON	75
THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY IN 1954—PART II. BY ASA BRIGGS	80
THE COMMONWEALTH IN A DIVIDED WORLD. BY JOHN BIGGS-DAVISON	87
NATIVE WELFARE IN SOUTH AFRICA. BY JOHN MOSS	94
CAN WAR BE AVOIDED? <i>Contemporary Opinions XVII</i> —PART II ...	104
THE ATTACK ON MONOPOLY. BY W. T. WELLS, M.P.	111
JOHN MORLEY IN POLITICS. BY M. R. D. FOOT	117
THE INWARD EYE— <i>Radio Listening: 2.</i> BY NORMAN NICHOLSON ...	124
THE ARCHAEOLOGISTS AND WEATHERCOCK— <i>Two Poems.</i> BY MARGARET STANLEY-WRENCH	126
FRENCH FARMERS IN COURT. BY LEN ORTZEN	127
<i>Correspondence</i> —INDIA'S FOREIGN POLICY. O. M. GREEN	132

THE FORTNIGHTLY LIBRARY:

VANBRUGH AND HAWKSMOOR. BY F. W. WENTWORTH-SHEILDS ...	133
--------------------------------------------------------	-----

Other Contributors: *David Thomson, W. Thomson Hill, S. Reed Brett, The Rev. B. C. Plowright, J. F. Burnet, Joshua C. Gregory, G. W. Horner, Loveday Martin, Grace Banyard.*

Printed by THE FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW LTD., at 80, High Street, Ashford, Kent. Trade Agents: Horace Marshall & Son, Ltd., Temple House, Tallis Street, London, E.C.4. Editorial correspondence and manuscripts to 50, Liddell Gardens, London, N.W.10.

While the Editor is glad to consider articles offered for publication, he cannot undertake to return MSS. unless accompanied by a stamped envelope.

Entered as second-class matter, January 4, 1934, at the Post Office at New York, N.Y., under the Act of March 3, 1897 (Sec. 397 P.L. & R.).

Registered for transmission by Canadian Magazine Post.

THE FORTNIGHTLY

AUGUST 1954

HOW WIDE IS THE ATLANTIC?

IT is obvious that the visit of Sir Winston and Mr. Eden to Washington has failed of success. Sir Winston may feel a legitimate satisfaction at his personal triumph over age and spiteful detractors. His White House reception may have lacked nothing of the warmth and hospitality that the friendliness of his host could provide. The 'Potomac Charter' suffered from no shortage of resonant idealism. Nevertheless the brute facts remain, that neither side has modified its essential position on the major issues, and that within less than a week of the end of the talks criticism, on each side, was as fierce as before. Sorrow may have succeeded anger as the predominant emotional element in the Atlantic cocktail, but the drink remains as potent and as bitter as ever. *Time* and Senator Knowland write us off as undependable; the House of Commons, whether the issue is Guatemala, Geneva or Dr. Cort, starts from the assumption that the Americans are dangerous allies and doubtful democrats.

It would not be surprising if, in such an inclement atmosphere, Sir Winston were to sigh for the comparative simplicities of wartime diplomacy when a couple of days consultation with his "great and good" friend, F.D.R., could restore the whole fabric of Anglo-American agreement—at least for operational purposes, and discounting the muttering of the ex-isolationists and Pacific Firsters. Why does the old formula no longer work? Partly, of course, because the operational purposes of 1954 are not as clear as those of 1944. We may still want to march shoulder to shoulder—but to what destination? Moscow? Peking? Guatemala City? Partly too, it is because the mutterers of 1944 have their hands on some at least of the controls of 1954. The Pacific Firsters have elected the Senate Majority Leader in Senator Knowland; the ex-isolationists fill half the chairmanships in Congress.

Yet with a President in the White House born and bred in the tradition of the Atlantic Community, one who has entered at first hand into our problems and our planning—for this chasm to have opened up beneath his feet and to seem too wide for bridging something must have gone wrong indeed. One thing that has gone wrong, of course, is American leadership. Congress is in one of its anarchic phases. When forced to act it responds to an uncertain and shifting balance of forces. There is no Vandenberg to rally Republican realists, while the Democrats have no better leader than Lyndon Johnson, hesitant senator from a state which is linked to the twentieth century more by technology than by psychology. Mr. Dulles is ill placed by temperament and the American

constitution to fill the vacuum. The President, it is now tragically apparent, is either unable or unwilling to use the potentialities of his great office to rally his supporters and confound his enemies. Something he will do, because the pressures of his time and his station leave him no alternative, but when he acts it will be always in reaction to outside pressures; he will not initiate pressure himself.

For this there is no remedy; at least none that lies in the hands of the British electorate. For the resolution of issues on which the President will not stand up to Congress, like the whole tangle of problems summed up in the words 'Red China', there is probably nothing to be done but wait. Wait until the November elections—not in any glib hope that the American voter will suddenly return a Congress ready to admit China to the U.N., but in the reasonable expectation that the mere arrival of polling day will reduce the temperature of argument and that the return of only a few more moderates may enlarge the area of diplomatic manoeuvre. It would be optimistic indeed to expect that any more conferences, any more arguments or speeches will bring British and American Far Eastern policies substantially closer in the interval. This may be gloomy; in view of the tempo of events in Indo-China it may be tragic, but it may as well be faced.

That does not mean that there is nothing Britain can or should do to check the widening of the Atlantic gap. It is significant that although Far Eastern differences may have precipitated the Washington meeting, it was on European problems that the conferees spent most of their time. When all is said and done Europe is the area that the President knows best, the continent to which he has given the most of his working life. Here too there is the least difference, fundamentally, between the goals and purposes of Britain and America. Yet it is precisely here that President Eisenhower can most legitimately feel that we have disappointed him. Here, where our position and our power properly equipped us to fill the rôle of leader, we have repeatedly shown diffidence and hesitation. We have not done what we could to back E.D.C., we have played fast and loose with Strasbourg, we have division in one of our great parties over an absolutely basic question of European policy. In the two years that have elapsed since President Eisenhower left SHAPE for the White House what progress has been made in rendering Europe defensible? Can Britain honestly affirm that she has done all that she should? To ask this is not to invite breast-beatings but to emphasize what the history of our times amply confirms—that Anglo-American relations thrive best when Britain is giving an active responsible leadership in Europe. In bargaining terms, achievement in Europe would strengthen our hand when it comes to arguing with Washington about the East. But more important than that, it would give to our partnership some of that sense of purpose and direction which it had in 1948 and which it must recover before it is too late.

AMERICAN POLICY IN SOUTH-EAST ASIA

BY C. NORTHCOTE PARKINSON

THE whole of South-East Asia is a potential battlefield and, so far as ideas are concerned, the battle has begun. As an area, it comprises much that is of value. It is a source of oil, rubber and tin; all three important in modern warfare. It includes bases essential to any power attempting to control the Indian Ocean. It includes bases vital to any power seeking to dominate the Pacific. It includes outposts necessary for the defence of Australia. And yet, as an area, it is practically defenceless, wide open to pressure, infiltration or invasion from the north. How vulnerable it is was demonstrated by the Japanese in 1942. But the Japanese have now yielded place (temporarily at least) to a vigorously reformed China of six hundred million inhabitants.

From a strategic and economic point of view, South-East Asia is of interest to both the British Commonwealth and the United States. Neither of these powers would like to see South-East Asia under Chinese control. Both are concerned with the defence of this region and both would like to see it capable of defending itself. Considered in the abstract, its defence might have been based as from 1946 upon the Colonial powers established there; Britain, France and the Netherlands. The only alternative was to base its defence upon States like Siam, which had never been annexed, and upon Colonial territories (like Burma) suddenly made autonomous. It must from the outset have been manifest that these independent States would be practically defenceless, lacking as they do either population, unity, wealth, industry or experience. It was only the Colonial powers that had any war potential worth considering.

The outcome of the 1939-1945 war was to make the United States supreme in the Pacific, victorious in a conflict from which Britain had been deliberately excluded. In the war against Japan, the British Commonwealth had played the part of a grateful but subordinate ally. The war concluded, it was therefore the Americans' privilege to propose terms of peace and exact a price for their intervention.

In the conduct of foreign policy or imperial strategy, a democratic government must labour under one enormous disadvantage: it cannot necessarily pursue its own interests. Its policy may be swayed by emotions and internal conflicts which are irrelevant to its strategic aims. The United States Government thus inherit a sacred mission to destroy

the empire from which their states were the first to secede. This mission is emotionally linked with school text-book stories about George III and Bunker's Hill, redcoats and the war of 1812. The mission extends, by analogy, to any remotely comparable empire, to colonialism as such. In the autonomy of territories formerly subject to Britain, France or the Netherlands, the true American feels emotionally satisfied. Nor does he pause to inquire whether American interests are best served by a policy based upon bedtime stories and the lessons well learnt at the infant school. In this respect the British voter is only a shade more adult. He too has vicariously rebelled against the rule of the very aristocracy which George Washington defeated (and to which he incidentally belonged). Nor, having prevented the aristocrats from ruling England, will he support them in ruling India. His ideas of democracy run counter to any pride he may ever have had in empire. He cannot logically deny to the Burmese the right of self-government he has claimed for himself.

With independence conceded to India, Pakistan and Burma, British control of the Indian Ocean vanished. The territories recovered from the Japanese, hitherto strategically dependent upon the forces of British India, were now hopelessly isolated; and Hong Kong would probably have been lost altogether had not the British reached it before the Americans. But if British prestige had declined, the prestige of France and the Netherlands had gone. With British connivance, the Dutch colonies were allowed to achieve independence as the State of Indonesia. The French recovered Indo-China but with its future independence understood. The British retained their colonial territories, also with mention of future autonomy, and well knew what American opposition would have been aroused by any attempt to extend them.

It was not until 1948 that the Chinese Communists drove Chiang Kai-shek southward in a movement which might not, of necessity, have been confined to the Chinese mainland. It then seemed possible that Communist armies might sweep onwards (unless opposed by the U.S.A.) carrying red revolution through Indo-China and Siam by the route which the Japanese had shown to be feasible. In that event, they would first encounter serious resistance in Malaya. Now, while it is recognized that little defence is possible at any point between the Tongking Delta and the Kra Isthmus, it is seldom pointed out that the Malayan frontier is also indefensible. It comes to be where it is through historical accident and no effort has been made towards moving it to its natural position at the isthmus itself. The opportunity of this adjustment existed at the conclusion of the 1939-1945 war, in which Siam had been virtually an opponent. It was lost, presumably from fear of Britain seeming imperialistic, and the frontier remains as difficult to justify as it would be to defend, leaving, as it does, a substantial Malay population on the wrong side of it. The problem of Communist banditry has been enormously complicated by the absence of a geographically defined

boundary.

Behind this weak frontier stands Malaya, a British protectorate, and behind Malaya lies the British colony of Singapore. Legally and morally, the British claim to hold Singapore is unassailable. Its Asian and mainly Chinese population is almost entirely immigrant, consisting of people who came there (or whose parents or grand-parents came there) in the knowledge that it was British territory and, indeed, for that very reason. Strategically, on the other hand, Malaya and Singapore are one. In isolation, as was soon apparent in 1942, Singapore cannot be defended at all. Granted however, that a military defence were centred on the Kra Isthmus, it is upon Singapore that its naval component would, of necessity, be based and without that naval co-operation (on *both* flanks) even the Kra position would be untenable. It is for these reasons that Malaya and Singapore can be regarded as a tactical unity, each part useless without the other.

Britain stands committed, partly through British and partly through American democratic sentiment, to a policy of granting self-government to both Malaya and Singapore. Progress has already been made towards introducing responsible government and democratic elections. A Malayan army is being formed and Asian candidates are being appointed to official positions. A very few years, in the ordinary course of events, will suffice to make Malaya as independent as Ceylon; and that is a goal which the British Government regard as desirable, not only from the Malayan but from the British point of view. So far as Britain is concerned, Malaya is a doubtful asset, its economic value counterbalanced by the cost of its defence and its strategic position far too isolated. To grant Malaya its independence is by far the cheapest policy. As against that, an independent Malaya can hardly be regarded as a barrier against Communism. With a mixed population, numbering less than seven million all told (of which nearly three million are Chinese), lacking unity in language or religion, lacking industry, dependent in part on imported food and living in a land of which four-fifths is covered by unproductive jungle, the Malaysians could offer little resistance to a Chinese army. Apart from that, many of them would welcome its success. And while the collapse of an autonomous Malaya might not be fatal to Britain, it would be unwelcome to Australia and the United States.

The Americans are thus in the difficult position of detesting 'colonialism' as such and yet feeling rightly apprehensive as to what will happen when the last colonial power has withdrawn. In the international field the Americans show, in fact, a tendency to kick into their own goal. They suffer not from weakness but from confusion as to what they are trying to do. Their official solution to the problem of how to exclude Communism (while demolishing every colonial power which tended to keep it out) is one of distressing simplicity. The free nations of South-

East Asia are to be grouped, with American encouragement and aid, into a new defensive alliance. Chinese Communism is to be restrained by a chain of allied nations extending from India to Australia. To this plan the main objection is that free nations are free to do as they like and not free merely to do what the Americans think they should.

Central to this proposed defence system (the S.E.A.T.O. plan) would be the Republic of Indonesia. It was very much through American insistence that this Republic came into being and its territories comprise merely the lands formerly under Dutch control, united by little more than a common resentment. The inhabitants number 80 million but are scattered over a wide area. Had the Dutch islands been united with Malaya and Borneo under British leadership (as Stamford Raffles planned) something might have been made of the resulting empire, integrated as a whole. But Indonesia, as actually constituted, is, as James H. Huizinga points out* "a pretty disorderly place" and not yet emerged from "as confused a period of fighting and quarrelling as ever gave rise to the birth of a nation." Nor is it at all likely that Indonesia would accept American help (and guidance) on any terms.

In Malaya the national feeling is probably well expressed by the *Singapore Standard* of June 24:

If Communism is to be contained in Asia, the first step should be for Western statesmen to view the affairs of Asia through the eyes of the peoples of Asia and formulate solutions in terms understood and appreciated by them. It is a mistake to believe that decisions arrived at in Washington or Paris or London by Western Statesmen could have any appreciable effect . . .

In fact, this attempt by the West to impose decisions arrived at without reference to Asian opinion has resulted in the emergence of what is often termed a neutralist policy in Asia . . .

A dynamic neutralist policy may, at the moment, be the best safeguard for peace in Asia. Mr. Nehru, as the leader of neutralist Asia, should be able to impress on Mr. Chou to what length neutralist Asian countries would go to be free of either Communist or Western control.

To those who can recall the actual events of the 1939-1945 war, the phrase "a dynamic neutralist policy" may seem a little unreal. Neutrals can fare ill in a world at war. But 'dynamic neutrality' is at least as real as the American conception of S.E.A.T.O. It is more real, in fact, for it has a measure of support. It represents, moreover, an important fact; that many Asians dislike the United States as much as they dislike Russia and far more than they dislike China. For the nations of South-East Asia to band together against China would not be for their own advantage but merely in the interests of the United States and Australia. For them to agree to any such plan would be most unwise.

What then of the future, supposing that the American plan is rejected? The first question to ask is what the Chinese Government actually intends. The last people in the world to find the answer to this question will be the Americans, who have never so far admitted that the

* *The Listener*, July 1.

Chinese Government even exist. In this they imitate what was the original Chinese attitude towards America and, indeed, towards Europe. The Chinese stoutly denied the existence of such places, contending that any lands so named could be no more than small islands on the fringe of the Celestial Empire which comprised their world. Intellectually (if not geographically) some Americans are in danger of making the same mistake. They refuse to recognize facts which conflict with their beliefs. China is such a fact—China as now constituted and governed. No good has ever come of refusing to face facts, and this is one which simply must be faced. Once fairly examined, the Chinese problem may prove capable of solution. It has been too readily assumed in Washington that Russian and Chinese aspirations are the same and that Communist world domination is a fair definition of either. But Chinese Communists are still Chinese and are as prejudiced against Russians as they are against Frenchmen or British. They feel, and with some reason, that they have been wrongly despised. They are ready to assert themselves, and not only against America. The Americans should remind themselves, incidentally, that the Communists of China mostly learnt their first lessons in revolution at American mission schools. Their progress has essentially been from Methodism to Marx.

If the Chinese are Communist in their own way, as seems certain, they are not of necessity committed to the conquest of South-East Asia. It is true that, with the colonial powers so gravely weakened and the new Asian countries so doubtfully stable, there is little to stop them unless it be the Americans themselves. But it does not follow that their ambitions lie in that direction. Their tactics have so far been defensive. That they have further and aggressive plans has yet to be proved. For the United States, the urgent task, therefore, is to establish such relations with China as to discover what the Chinese intentions are. The same contacts will reveal to the Chinese how little the Americans' interests need conflict with theirs. It was obvious for many years that Japan would eventually clash with the United States. Would it have served any useful purpose to have severed relations between Washington and Tokyo, simply because such a clash was probable? On the contrary, it was through those normal diplomatic relations that the Americans had ample warning of what was to come. Diplomatic courtesies imply no approval of the way a land is ruled. If they did, Great Britain need never have recognized the independence of the American colonies. In recognizing their independence, the British were not viewing the matter with enthusiasm. They were merely recognizing a fact. The first step towards peace in South-East Asia will be for the Americans to display as much sense of reality as was shown by George III. And George, remember, was not even sane.

(The author is Professor of History at the University of Malaya; his recent book War in the Eastern Seas 1793-1815 was reviewed in the April 1954 issue of THE FORTNIGHTLY.)

THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY IN 1954

PART II

BY ASA BRIGGS

ALTHOUGH the Authority faces a serious power crisis in the next few years, it is too strongly-rooted an organization to be in danger of total collapse. Its original purpose has succeeded; "democracy at the grass roots" has been achieved, and the political and social basis of its power in the South is assured. A few years ago the Governors of the seven states in which T.V.A. operates were asked their views about it. They were unanimous in approving both of its constitution and its daily operations. The Governor of Tennessee remarked that far from the rights of the State and its citizens having been restricted or violated by the growth of the new federal agency, they had been enlarged. The Governor of Alabama added that T.V.A., "conducted with vision and regard for local agencies", had "made a tremendous contribution to public welfare." The conservative Governor of Georgia went even further: "The only complaint I have regarding T.V.A.", he said, "is that its influence has not permeated this state further." The warmth of such testimonials has not diminished with the years. When the Mayor of Knoxville presented a petition to President Eisenhower in early March, asking for the re-appointment of Gordon Clapp as chairman of T.V.A. he began by claiming that "for the last two decades, the Tennessee Valley programme might be described as a living, breathing, and an outstanding example of resource development, of great encouragement to the over 5,000,000 people in the Tennessee Valley service area."

The appeal of T.V.A. to the people of the region which it serves has been enhanced by the practical policy which the Board of T.V.A. has followed. The idea of regional planning from above has been rejected and in its place has been substituted encouragement of planned action by existing agencies and institutions. The Act setting up T.V.A., particularly in sections 22 and 23, had provided for regional planning under presidential direction. In the depression-dominated atmosphere of 1933, when there was a sense of economic emergency, it was believed by New Dealers that a blue print of the future of the Tennessee Valley was an appropriate and useful undertaking for the Board of T.V.A. From 1935 onwards, however, the Board in effect rejected the idea of drawing up a master plan and sought rather to find for T.V.A. a place in a region where "planning is the democratic task of many institutions and

countless individuals." To-day no T.V.A. activities are carried on under sections 22 and 23 of the Act, which allowed for direct planning. Instead the activities of T.V.A. are interwoven with the general activities of states, voluntary organizations, and professional bodies. To attack T.V.A. in 1954 is to attack not a bureaucratic dictatorship but a whole network of freely-operated community organizations. No politician, however hostile to the idea of federally-owned power, dare attack the social offshoots of T.V.A. in the areas which it serves.

The co-operation between T.V.A. and other local bodies can be illustrated from every branch of its work. In the case of afforestation, T.V.A. maintains a nursery which provides millions of young trees. But from this point onwards it leaves the task of timber control to the farmers themselves. It is they who have co-operated spontaneously to introduce fire protection and limitation of cutting. The forest resources are thus kept healthy and expanding, and timber is never cut at a faster rate than it grows. In the case of fertilizers, T.V.A. has a chemical plant at Muscle Shoals, the nation's only large laboratory and experimental centre for the development of fertilizers. But T.V.A. does not sell them itself. A large part of them reach the market through farmers co-operatives and private companies. The rest are used in test demonstrations on practical farms to encourage soil conservation and improved farm management.

In the case of agricultural education, use is made at every point of the land grant colleges in the different states covered by T.V.A. In deciding in 1935 to make the land grant colleges the state agents for organizing fertilizer experiments, the T.V.A. Board rejected the alternatives of directly supervising fertilizing testing or creating special and additional state agencies. The choice of the land grant colleges for this purpose implied a major decision to encourage land re-development through individual farm owners. It foretold a shifting emphasis from public ownership of marginal lands towards educational processes to strengthen private land use. In the case of recreation, T.V.A. has opened up dozens of new facilities. New lakes have been built, which provide fishing and boating holidays, and 12 state parks, totalling 14,500 acres, have been added to the nation's open spaces. Alabama has two of these parks, Kentucky three and Tennessee seven. The great Smoky Mountains National Park with its hill-billies and superb long-distance views borders the north shore of Fontana Lake, one of the most important of T.V.A. dams. But T.V.A. does not operate or develop recreation facilities or provide recreation services on its own account. Recreation businesses and services are managed by private enterprise or by public agencies other than T.V.A.

The encouragement of other agencies than itself in all spheres of its operations has been accompanied by gradual withdrawal from agreements reached with the states involving the use of federal money to sup-

plement local action. T.V.A. decided that while it would continue to stimulate new activities by the states and even grant them temporary financial assistance, it would ultimately withdraw its direct support. It hoped and assumed that worth-while activities and state action would in time secure permanent support from regular unsubsidized appropriations. Under a policy announced in 1947 all the T.V.A. research and development contracts with state governments, which had formerly been on a continuing basis, have been terminated or scheduled for termination. While some contracts for new activities have been negotiated, the total contract expenditure has been reduced from a million dollars in 1947 to considerably less than half that amount to-day. During the same period funds from state resources for resource development plans in the region have more than doubled, while federal aid increased by about a third.

Quite apart from the effect of increased local initiative on the pattern of resource development in the T.V.A. area, there has been a profound change in the attitude of local people—in their vigour, their energy and their optimism. As the recent petition to President Eisenhower put it: "Through this wise and far reaching programme, the people of the area have grown in strength. The Valley region itself has been transformed from a national liability to a strong national resource . . . During these 20 years, the people of our area have grown closer to their local Government, better able to understand the necessary relations between the national Government and themselves. Through the T.V.A. programme, expanded opportunity has been given to further develop their feeling of pride and accomplishment as citizens."

* * *

There are many interesting cases of a complete transformation in the outlook of the farming community. Take Lum Cummings of Franklin county, Alabama. In 1937 he had an 80 acre farm with 26 acres devoted to cotton, 17 to soya beans, and 16 to corn. Cotton was his only source of cash; not surprisingly he was almost bankrupt. One day in 1937, his county agent asked him whether he would be willing to try out some new fertilizers provided by T.V.A. to test their effects on pastures and other cover crops. He was willing to try only because he thought that in such dark times any change would be for the better. T.V.A. technicians helped him to draw up a programme for the sound use of fertilizers in growing clover grass pastures, perennials and other cover crops. He started by clearing swamp land, improving 17 acres of pasture, buying his first herd of cattle and improving the cultivation of his main crop. By 1942 he had doubled his acreage, all his beef cattle were pure-bred animals, and he had introduced pigs, crimson clover and vetch seed to augment his sources of income. By 1951 he owned nearly a thousand acres, a herd of 200 registered Herefordshire cattle, and a greatly improved farmhouse for his family. For several years he had been selling seed saved from pasture when he had been

Fortunate enough to have a good seed crop. The Lum Cummings pasture mixture was well-known throughout the whole of his area; so too was the farm itself, so that in 1950 more than 5000 people visited it. No one could call the story of Lum Cummings a story of creeping socialism or of bureaucratic control; it reads more like a characteristic American success story, "from red ink to green grass." "We came up the hard way" Cummings said; "we never bought any seed except at the beginning. We have saved our own. For the first few years we rubbed out the seed by hand, because we did not have a combine or the money to buy one. We pulled weeds by hand and carried them out of the pasture in a pick-sack." Only by such hard work did the farm prosper.*

The same story is true of a test farm which I visited near Knoxville in Tennessee. Its owner, Mr. Montgomery, has operated it as a test farm only for eight years, but it has been in the hands of the Montgomery family since ten years before the start of the Civil War. During the last 20 years he has watched not only his own farm prosper, but the whole life of the neighbourhood develop in a way which would have been thought inconceivable in 1933. A new community club, a new church, lots of new houses—these are visible symbols of progress. And farmers' deep suspicions of clover, or of new crops have gradually withered away.

No farmer has been obliged to improve his methods, for T.V.A. has had no authority to coerce. The farmers themselves have got together to improve their own conditions. Out of their experiences they have evolved a philosophy which although naïve to the outsider is very satisfying to them. As one of them told me, "a teaspoonful of soil contains the secrets of the universe." God gave the soil: man must conserve it. He must capture and utilize all lost and wasted energy, and restore harmony to the conflicting forces of nature. Providence and T.V.A. thus work hand in hand, and a matter of technique becomes a matter of faith.

One of the classic cases of T.V.A. raising the whole level of community life is that of Decatur, Alabama. David Lilienthal went there in the middle of the Depression and told the local community how to improve social and economic conditions. He discussed the outline of the problem of resources to an audience which was for the most part hostile, since, as the editor and publisher of the local newspaper said, "he represented to us another way of thought and another way of life." He told the local people about what he called "the tools of opportunity"—flood control, malaria control, navigation on the river, low cost power, and test demonstration farming. Given proper control, he maintained, the river would no longer defeat man, but would become his servant. Only the local people themselves, however, could improve existing con-

* J. C. Lowery summarizes the story in *The Progressive Farmer* (October 1951).

ditions: "I am not going to do anything with these tools" he remarked; "what you do with them is up to you." By taking David Lilienthal's advice, Decatur began to move for the first time in its history. It set up a chamber of commerce, a packing plant, and a milk co-operative. It began to diversify both agriculture and industry and to rationalize its distributive system. In 1935 the people of Decatur were "dozing in the sunshine waiting for that once-a-year payroll brought by cotton, and wearing out our second finest resource, the land." In 1954 there was a local market for cotton, corn, wheat, livestock, milk, timber, small grains and truck crops. In 1939 there were 3800 customers buying electric power; by 1950 there were 7000. The population doubled. New entrants came in to share the prosperity of the neighbourhood; the latest industrial arrival is a copper-processing plant which decided to set up a branch in the South. But bigger than all the material changes has been the change in the character of the people. "We have come from the status of a well-nigh beaten citizenship, merely existing," the editor has written, "to a hopeful, exuberant, smilingly confident people, secure in the belief that given the opportunities afforded through making the forces of nature the servant of man, and with intelligent determination, and sound application of the principles of economics, we could rise to heights of good citizenship." To those who ask him: "Wouldn't this all have happened without T.V.A.?", the editor replies simply: "it didn't."* The answer is the same as that given by the petitioners of President Eisenhower: "because of T.V.A.'s efficient administration", they remark, "it would seem that an almost all-seeing and wise directing Province has guided their [the Board's] every action."

The Mayor of Knoxville, Mr. Dempster, one of the men who presented the petition, must be one of the most colourful characters in the South. T.V.A., he told me, came to Tennessee like manna from Heaven. Before 1933 Tennessee was completely dependent upon cotton and the farmers were completely dependent upon mules. Since 1933 the dominion of cotton has been broken, and everybody—even the opponent of T.V.A.—is better off. Business men have benefited from the increase in local income and the diversification of industry—and the Mayor himself is a business man, "in politics only on the side." Farmers have benefited from new crops and new methods. Local hotel managers and shopkeepers have benefited from the development of the tourist trade ("one tourist equals two bales of cotton and is not so hard to pick"). The nation has benefited from the cheap power which made possible the manufacture of the atomic bomb: the bomb would have been delayed for two to four years if there had been no T.V.A. (yet Senator McCarthy in his frequent talk of treasonable delays has not bothered to talk about this one). In 50 years' time, the Mayor goes on,

* Barrett Shelton, *The Decatur Story*, An Address to the United Nations Scientific Conference on the Conservation and Utilization of Resources, September 1949, reprinted by T.V.A.

T.V.A. will make large profits for the state, and even the inhabitants of Arizona or Montana will benefit directly from its operations. If anyone asks the Mayor whether all this can be called "creeping socialism", he keeps his temper and asks whether the Panama Canal is an example of creeping socialism. Surely, he argues, the Chattanooga Chamber of Commerce knows better what T.V.A. is doing than the New York Chamber of Commerce. He still hopes that President Eisenhower will withstand pressure to limit T.V.A.'s operations. When he went to Washington to present the petition he told the President that Tennessee merely wished to be treated at the present time as America treated its enemies in 1945. "Don't bother to treat us like allies" he told the President; "we shall be perfectly content to be treated as generously as the people of Berlin or Tokyo." In other words he does not regard T.V.A. as some welfare agency administered at great distance by national politicians, but as a central feature of local community life. Like David Lilienthal, he is an inveterate optimist, although his present vision of the future—dominated by the dream of highly-developed atomic power—may be described as post-Lilienthal. He anticipates co-operation between T.V.A. and the agencies exploiting atomic energy to help build a world of plenty. At some bright moment in the future there will be no more need for the age-long association between strong arms and weak heads.

The T.V.A. petition was drawn up by a new body called 'Citizens for T.V.A. Inc.' It appeals to all those who "(1) believe in T.V.A.; (2) resent being lied about; (3) dare fight the power trust; (4) will take time out to fight; (5) don't want higher electricity bills; (6) want their region to grow; (7) will put up some money."

The need for organization, the new association claims, is based on the attack made by power companies on the T.V.A. experiment: "the lobbyists of the National Association of Electrical Companies forced us to fight to defend our region and our own economic futures." They could not kill T.V.A. with facts: "so their high publicity men invented 'creeping socialism'." Though they started the battle they cannot win it, however, if the people of Tennessee and the surrounding states stand firm. "*We* are going to win", 'Citizens for T.V.A.' claims; "we believe that the easiest way to win is to work through existing organized groups in T.V.A.'s power service area. An actual poll would show our people better than nine to one for T.V.A. The six million citizens living in T.V.A.'s power service area, however, won't get a chance to vote on an issue like this . . . our best course, under the circumstances, is to bring the massed power of six million people to bear upon our enemies. Aroused, organized, and battling together our people can achieve any goal. They have economic power. They have political power. Their cause has moral appeal. Mobilized and expressed by the groups through which our people normally act and speak, this power and this appeal will win." The battle may last for two or three years—"we did

not want to wait until we were hit even worse"—but at the end of it public opinion will surely win a victory over vested interest.

Opponents of the new organization dismiss it as an offshoot of Senator Kefauver's state Democratic machine, but it is clearly more than this. The philosophy it expresses may be as simple as the philosophy expressed by the local farmers, but it has an authentic ring about it, which suggests that it must be taken seriously. T.V.A. may be undergoing a serious short-term power crisis, but so long as an organization of this type galvanizes local feeling, it need not fear anything more serious.

* * *

Part of the reason for confidence in the future rests in the nature of T.V.A.'s links not only with the anti-Depression policies of 1933 but with more ancient American tradition. In the early years of the Republic, Patrick Henry wrote that "since the achievement of our independence, he is the greatest patriot which stops the most gullies." A little later, in 1824, the Secretary of War, J. C. Calhoun, sent to President Monroe a Report recommending an ambitious plan for developing the Tennessee river at Muscle Shoals as part of an even bigger scheme to create an integrated road, canal and river network. In the early twentieth century, during the administration of Theodore Roosevelt, there was much interest in the problems of conserving and developing natural resources. The idea behind T.V.A. was well described by Gifford Pinchot, chief forester on the Roosevelt, as early as 1907. As he was riding on horseback through the countryside, "suddenly the idea flashed through my head that all these separate questions (of different natural resources and their employment) fitted into and made up the one great central problem of the use of the earth for the good of man." It is well to remind a mid-twentieth century Republican President and Congress that the concepts written into the T.V.A. Act did not spring from "any neat pre-conceived set of theories about politics or government; they evolved from the reflective observations, studies and experience of the scientists and from the informed concern of laymen who initiated the conservation movement."* None of the activities which T.V.A. has taken upon itself have been new to federal government, nor have the powers which it has employed. The uniqueness of T.V.A. has consisted in the range of function combined for administration in one agency in one area. Unless there is to be a sharp break with the American past, T.V.A. is likely to survive all its crises, and perhaps one day there will be general agreement that it is among the most American of all American political and economic institutions.

(The author, a Fellow of Worcester College, Oxford, has recently returned from the U.S.A. Part I of "The Tennessee Valley Authority in 1954" was published in the last number of THE FORTNIGHTLY.)

* T.V.A., *The Use of the Earth for the good of Man*, the principal text of T.V.A.'s Annual Report to Congress for the Fiscal Year ended June 30, 1953. (Washington, 1954).

THE COMMONWEALTH IN A DIVIDED WORLD

BY JOHN BIGGS-DAVISON

IF the Commonwealth has anything to offer the world, it is scepticism of organization and a belief in empirical diplomacy, but that contribution it has ceased to make." This is the melancholy conclusion of Mr. T. E. Utley's article in the last number of *THE FORT-NIGHTLY*.^{*} He attributed the present rigid division of the world to "rigid diplomatic conceptions based on the idea that the supreme end of diplomacy is absolute security, and on failure to appreciate that absolute security is incompatible with freedom to manoeuvre." If the western powers are to regain their freedom to manoeuvre and if the Commonwealth is to make that contribution which, Mr. Utley thinks, "it has ceased to make", more practical and effective expression will have to be given to its economic significance and a greater combined effort made to develop its massive resources, many of which are still undeveloped or even unsurveyed.

England's ability to give leadership to the Commonwealth, to contribute to the cause of European unity, and to act constructively within the North Atlantic Alliance rests in great measure upon her traditional and moral standing. It must also rest upon her economic capacity and potential and upon the productivity of British agriculture and industry whose recovery and expansion have been marked but insufficient. It is not enough to castigate obsolete methods or indifferent management and to preach thrift and the gospel of work to highly organized trade unionists still conscious of the memory of mass unemployment. If Labour is to pull its weight without fear of unmerited unemployment, if patient research and bold experiment are to flourish under private enterprise, if private enterprise is to be enabled to invest enough in the improvement and re-equipment of farm and factory, taxation must be substantially reduced and long-term opportunities provided in sure and expanding markets. Although the conclusion is unfashionable, to secure these markets reasonable protection will be essential and will become more so as controls are done away with, as individual trading replaces bulk purchase agreements of a long-term character and an approach is made to the full convertibility of currencies. To secure her Commonwealth markets Great Britain must make herself more productive of the goods, chiefly capital equipment, which her partners need to increase their primary production and establish such secondary industries as they may decide

^{*} "The Commonwealth and Europe" by T. E. Utley. July 1954.

to set up.

Our island resources are strained and the London Conference of Commonwealth Finance Ministers decided to concentrate British capital resources available for overseas on projects helpful to the general balance of payments of the sterling area. Proposals emanating from the World Bank that sterling should be increasingly devoted to the financing of development of foreign countries outside the sterling area should surely be resisted. British savings and British capital are needed for Commonwealth and empire development, and inducement, policy and preference should be used to make it more generously available for this purpose. Now the overseas countries of the Commonwealth, rather than the United Kingdom, appear unenthusiastic for the preferential idea. Times have changed since the Ottawa Conference. Industrialization has taken place in the overseas Commonwealth and the colonial empire. This process will continue although it may be slowed down for a while by a growing world demand for more food and raw materials. Chief place is rightly given in the Colombo Plan to agricultural development. Great Britain for her part is growing, and will grow, more food at home. It seems therefore that ample scope will remain for the mutual balancing within the Commonwealth and Empire of the surpluses and deficiencies of its members. The United Kingdom will remain the world's largest market for foodstuffs of all kinds, and is second only to the United States in her demand for raw materials, and the Dominions would think very seriously again about preference if they did not take almost for granted the privilege of general duty-free entry into our market. Industrial development overseas will demand an ever-growing supply of capital equipment such as British industry can well produce and provide an expanding market for quality consumer goods.

In November 1952, Mr. John H. Williams of Harvard advocated in the course of his Stamp Memorial Lecture at the University of London "larger trading units able to cope on more nearly equal terms with the United States." The sterling empire and Commonwealth is already such a unit but by virtue of defensive restrictions rather than of a coherent plan of expansion. The very nature of the Commonwealth forbids its amalgamation into a federal and fiscal union. Empire free trade is impracticable and imperial federation a dead cause. The only feasible and desirable alternative is the constitution of a preferential group or series of preferential groups. Such unfortunately are at present under the cloud of international agreements and of United States policy. Customs unions are encouraged but are out of the question for the Commonwealth. A typical American view is well put by Professor Clair Wilcox in *A Charter for Western Trade*:

Preferences have been opposed and customs unions favoured in principle by the United States. This position may obviously be criticized as lacking in logical consistency. In preferential arrangements discrimination against the outside world is partial; in customs unions, it is complete. But the distinction is none the less

defensible. A customs union creates a wider free trade area, removes obstacles to competition, makes for a more economic allocation of resources, and thus operates to increase production and to raise standards of living. A preferential system is set up for the purpose of conferring a privilege on producers within the system and imposing a handicap on external competitors. A customs union is conducive to the expansion of trade on a basis of multilateralism and non-discrimination; a preferential system is not.

When free trade England possessed economic mastery free trade became economic orthodoxy. A customs union is the appropriate fiscal system for a continental federation such as the U.S.A., or for that matter the U.S.S.R. Both these empires are fiercely protected systems, the one using tariffs and subsidies, the other a totalitarian monopoly of foreign trade. It was mainly because the six Schuman countries in western Europe were planning a complete integration on the American model, rather than a preferential area such as has been advocated for all the free European nations in the Strasbourg Plan of the Council of Europe, that they promptly obtained a waiver from the provisions of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade which restricted their right to discriminate in favour of each other in respect of coal and iron and steel. If thinking Americans require to be convinced that economic co-operation between sovereign States must take a different form, they might well consider the preferential arrangements which were entered into by their own country with Cuba and the Philippines. Customs unions pledged to non-discrimination are as unsuitable to most countries to-day as was free trade in the nineteenth century. As Lord Swinton told the House of Lords on March 31, 1954, it is "neither logical, nor sensible, nor fair, to say that a customs union which enabled a group of countries to encircle themselves with an all-embracing prohibitive tariff ring was a blessed thing but that the looser and far less prohibitive system of Imperial Preference was something wicked."

Free trade and *laissez-faire* have dominated economic thought but their history has been short. The idea that the devil should be allowed to take the hindmost was alien to medieval canons. Paternalism and protection were characteristic of Tudor and early Stuart monarchy. Our early colonial system was a closed economy. Huskisson and Peel made it something better, a moderate system of tariff preferences. But Sir Robert Peel did not stop there; not only were the Corn Laws repealed and British agriculture sacrificed but Colonial Preference was abandoned to the dismay or ruin of our fellow-subjects overseas. While England fought hostile tariffs with free imports, France, Germany and the United States nourished nascent industries on tariff protection. By the 1914-1918 war both the United States and Germany had outstripped us in industrial production.

When in 1887 the Australian statesman Alfred Deakin met John Bright in London he complained that the mother country, instead of treating the colonies like children, put them on the same footing in her

markets "as enemies and rivals". Despite the fair trade and tariff reform movements it was Canada which took the initiative when the revival of imperial preference began. During the 1914-1918 war Great Britain imposed various protective duties and the 1919 Budget made all existing customs duties preferential in favour of empire countries. A decade later the world depression impelled the abandonment of the gold standard, the consequent and successful formation of the sterling area and the 11 agreements signed at Ottawa in 1932. Great Britain agreed to continue existing preferences on Dominion products and to extend them to wheat, meat and other imports. The Dominions and India agreed to lower tariffs in favour of certain British goods and to widen the margin of preference in favour of others.

Here were the beginnings of an imperial economic system arising from the needs and free consent of its members. Its scope was reduced by the Anglo-American Trade Agreement concluded in November 1938, when war threatened and American co-operation was of first importance. Imperial preference was however defended against American pressure and misunderstanding through the years of war and in the heyday of the Roosevelt régime, in 1943, earned this tribute from the United States Department of Commerce:

The record of the '30's demonstrated that foreign countries, save for those narrowly dependent on the American market, could adapt themselves, after initial serious disturbance, to a relatively low level of exchange with the United States and yet attain a substantial internal prosperity and promote their trade with each other . . .

The members of the sterling bloc were, on the whole, outstanding. They not only attained, for the most part, their pre-depression of production and income by 1935, but also maintained virtually complete exchange stability among themselves, once the realignment of their currency ratios had been made during the depression, without depending on exchange controls or other intricate measures of direct intervention in the trading mechanism.

The British economy to-day is insulated by "exchange controls" and "other measures of direct intervention" of a very restrictive character.

Preferential arrangements on the other hand provide a framework for the expansion of trade by private enterprise. Far from restricting world trade, imperial preference helped its recovery from the depression of the 1930's and provided stable areas for investment. In 1936 the Economic Committee of the League of Nations recorded that as the United States "did not at the same time adopt a policy of tariff agreements the [most favoured nations] clause—for which they invariably pressed—enabled them to continue to impose duties which were in some cases prohibitive, without fear of discrimination, while they had the benefit of all concessions made to one another by other countries." This attitude was restrictive of a free flow of international trade, and countries were deterred from initiating negotiations for tariff reductions.

The sterling area emerged from the depression by a denial of the principle but what was sauce for the goose was not allowed to be sauce

for the gander. British policy vetoed the Ouchy Convention for reciprocal tariffs between Belgium and Holland and prevented like agreements between the Oslo powers. In the absence of nation-groups able to breathe and to stand, various forms of "national socialism" ran amok, the genius of Dr. Schacht was given full expression and a new *Drang nach Osten* led on to the final collision in 1939. The Atlantic Allies should not repeat these follies. Now as then the enforcement of non-discrimination is likely to evoke reactions which are hostile to free enterprise, subversive of human liberty, incompatible with prosperity and dangerous to international peace.

A non-discriminatory system for the free world based on dollar aid and rigid gold parities involves a heavy excess of United States exports over United States imports and a consequent universal dis-equilibrium. It is unrealistic and unreasonable to expect a lasting balance to be achieved by a pronounced and permanent increase of exports to America. Unlike Great Britain in the nineteenth century, the United States is not the world's great buyer of goods so much as the world's greatest potential seller. American tariffs have been reduced but are unlikely to be effectively lowered without subsidies or other counterbalancing measures. What Mr. George Wyndham said in 1892 has still some relevance: "The man who believes that the American artisan or the French small proprietor will ever give up protection so long as it makes the first rich, and saves the second from starvation, is unfit for public life."

Even the removal of their tariffs could not make Americans buy what they can well make themselves nor are they likely to sacrifice their livelihood to help foreigners earn dollars. The American Congressman and elector may well prefer to extend the principle of aid rather than to encourage "trade not aid"; the importing is a minority interest. Foreign aid means and has meant high taxation but it has helped to restrain inflation. It has provided for the export of farm and other surpluses and thus for the export of unemployment. Private capital is commonly a coward and foreign aid has taken over many of the functions of the American private investor.

American aid in one form or another has done wonders in connection with the recovery of Great Britain and of free Europe but the added weight it has given to the exorcizing of preference has added to the difficulties of the recipient countries. The dollar has become a drug acting as a welcome palliative but making complete recovery impossible. It would be better for all concerned if agreement could be reached on the stabilization of American demand for sterling area raw materials and other outside products both in price and in quantity so that the rest of the world could bring purchases from the United States as quickly as possible into balance with the dollars earned. The complementary policies would be a re-direction of the American economy towards development at home. Mr. Morris S. Rosenthal, who is now President

of the United States Council of the International Chamber of Commerce, declared in October 1952, when he was a delegate to the United Nations Commission for Asia and the Far East:

The United States Government should withdraw the policy whereby it throws the weight of the whole Government behind the promotion of exports. Give the other countries a chance to re-establish themselves in the foreign markets of the world, to regain and recapture the share that they held before the last war. That, in itself, will ensure the disappearance of the dollar gap.

The unattainable aim of non-discrimination should be abandoned and the preferential tariff reinstated. By this means nations and regions and groups of nations having historical affinities or common ideals and interests would be able to maintain themselves and prosper.

Much confused thinking on economic policy is connected with the belief that national sovereignty is the cause of conflict and that the nation is a transient and primitive phenomenon due to be submerged in a super-State. This kind of determinist philosophizing ignores the organic nature of the nation which, like the family, is fundamental to civilization and a starting point for European unity or international co-operation. With every new improvement in communications the pre-fabricated supra-national authority becomes less and less justifiable. The Commonwealth has shown that nationalism can be constructive as well as destructive and that independent sovereignties can work fruitfully together. The Commonwealth is building something more delicate and more valuable than a super-State. As the Prime Minister told the American Congress in January 1952: "The British Commonwealth of Nations, spread all over the world, is not prepared to become a group of States in any continental federal system on either side of the Atlantic." Every nation has something special to contribute to the wealth and civilization of mankind. For individual businesses, economic areas and sovereign powers there is probably an optimum size. World government is incompatible with free institutions and government by the true consent of the governed.

For the Commonwealth or for any group of sovereign States preference is the means of economic collaboration. As was suggested in for example the Strasbourg Plan, members of such groups can guard basic national interests and industries against all comers while exchanging reciprocal advantages first among themselves, then with others. Preference is necessary to a sound balance of trade and payments and thus to any advance to full convertibility and multilateral trade. Preference in capital investment, raw material supplies, transport and trade and migration can give the Commonwealth partnership a firm foundation of profitable business. But the partnership may break, and the colonies look for independence outside the Commonwealth, if their development is stunted through indifference or inappropriate fiscal policies in the mother country. It is neither right nor prudent that Great Britain or any other independent member of the sterling area should draw on the dollar earnings of colonial producers deposited in the sterling dollar pool

and fail to make appropriate return in the form of capital or goods or services. Rome lived on her provinces and Rome fell.

At Sydney in January the Commonwealth Ministers noted "the forthcoming review of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and agreed that there should be prior consultation among Commonwealth countries." The Randall Report and the President of the United States have asked for re-negotiation. The Commonwealth should press for a form of re-negotiation which will rescind the "no new preference" rule and enable the most favoured nation clause in commercial treaties to be transformed from its unconditional form to a conditional form—conditional, that is, on effective reciprocity. The nations of the Commonwealth and all nations would then be free to make preferential agreements among themselves and to look outward with confidence to dealings of mutual benefit with foreign countries.

It would be possible for specially intimate arrangements to be made between members of the Commonwealth, such as Australia and New Zealand or the Asian members, which are neighbours or have similar economic standards. It is impossible to discuss here Canada's anomalous exclusion from the sterling area. She may decide in the future to grow closer to the sterling Commonwealth but in any case she would retain special trading relations with the United States. A suggestion was made at a recent conference in Karachi of the International Islamic Economic Organization that Pakistan should exchange preferences with other Muslim States. Great Britain for her part requires a closer economic connection with her European neighbours than do her Commonwealth partners, although the Continent is an important market and supplier of capital goods for overseas countries and the position of sterling as the leading continental currency is of great service to the whole sterling area.

It is through the progressive realization of such policies that we shall be better enabled to fulfil our duty to our companions of the Commonwealth and to the advancement of the colonial dependencies where Communism finds increasing opportunity of mischief. Without such policies we shall hardly maintain our national independence, furnish from within the Commonwealth the means of defence, for which we still lean upon American generosity, or provide for the social and economic welfare of our peoples.

Besides the empire and Commonwealth, there is a proper place for preferential areas or groups in Latin-America, in Asia and the Far East and in Europe with which the Commonwealth might be well advised to make interlocking secondary preferences as suggested in the Strasbourg Plan. The more stability and confidence and expanding trade is strongly based upon national and regional realities and interests the more hope there will be of the economic erosion of the Iron Curtain by a balanced free world order.

(The author is a member of the Conservative Party Research Department.)

NATIVE WELFARE IN SOUTH AFRICA

BY JOHN MOSS

MUCH has been written in this country about the South African problem, or 'dilemma' and well-meaning people have expressed strong views on the racial policy of the present Nationalist Government. It is easy to criticize and it is natural for freedom-loving people in this country and elsewhere, and particularly religious leaders, to feel very concerned that African Natives, or the Bantu as they are generally known in South Africa, should not have the freedom to develop on lines which are being encouraged by our own Government in the Colonial territories of East and West Africa. But public opinion in Britain, however sincere, is not likely to have any effect on the policy of the South African Government and, as was so well put recently by Earl Winterton in the *Daily Telegraph*, "speeches and sermons here help and do not deter Dr. Malan and embarrass alike his South African opponents and the Episcopal Church in South Africa which is trying to combat racialism in its own way." In a recent visit to South Africa I was sorry to see the prominence which was given in the newspapers to speeches by some sincere people in this country and which appeared more likely to increase the antagonism which unfortunately exists against Britishers by many Afrikaners. We have heard much criticism of the South African Government and I think it is only fair that we should recognize what is being done for the Natives by the Government, local authorities and social agencies. The Dutch Reformed Church is solidly behind the Government. It is sometimes suggested by British writers that this Church is narrow in its outlook, but who are we to judge? The Church is certainly sincere in its views about racial separation and European predominance, whether we agree with these views or not. If the strength of any Church can be judged by the proportion of its nominal adherents who are regular churchgoers, or the time they spend reading the Bible, or the money given for religious and social causes the Churches in this country lag far behind the Dutch Reformed Church. A noteworthy example of this is the money subscribed by its members to the British and Foreign Bible Society, not only for work in South Africa but also to help the work of the society in other parts of the world.

Dr. Malan, in a recent statement on the policy of *Apartheid* said there was a fundamental difference between the two groups of white and black and that racial differences are pronounced. The Afrikaner believes it

to be his Christian duty to convert the heathen without obliteration of their national identity. Dr. Malan said that since 1947-48 the Government had increased expenditure on Non-European education from £3,665,600 to an estimated sum of £8,190,000 for the financial year 1953-54; he referred to the schemes for physical rehabilitation, and said that disability grants and old age pensions are available to Natives. On housing he said £18½ million had been granted in loans for native housing since 1945. Critics of the Government would probably suggest that this statement does not indicate what is being done, or is proposed to be done, for the Natives as a whole, of whom there are approximately nine millions as compared with some three million Whites. I have no personal knowledge of Natives on the Reserves or in the other rural areas but in this article I can deal with their position in the urban areas. For it is their condition in the cities, such as Johannesburg, which has been most criticized by English writers, and so much has been written about the shanty towns of Johannesburg and Durban that it is only fair to put the other side of the picture.

When considering the problem of providing housing, education, health services and social amenities for the Natives in the urban areas account should be taken of the population factor as most of the public expenditure on the welfare of Non-Europeans must be met by the Europeans. The following figures as to the size of the population are striking:

Johannesburg—Europeans 349,900 ; African Natives 497,700 ; Asiatics 17,300 ;
Total 864,900.

Durban—Europeans 146,805; Coloured 16,932; African Natives 142,091; Asiatics 157,292; Total 463,120.

Cape Town—Europeans 174,609; Coloured 154,064; Cape Malays, 43,069; African Natives 38,344; Asiatics 6,488; Total 416,574.

Pretoria—Europeans 132,000; Coloured 4,100; Asiatics 5,600; African Natives 100,300; Total 242,000.

East London—Europeans 43,780; Coloured 5,877; African Natives 40,457; Asiatics 1,593; Total 91,707.

The area covered by some of the South African cities is considerable. Greater Durban has 57 square miles; the comparatively small city of East London covers an area of nearly 12 square miles; Johannesburg, including the new Native locations, extends to 93 square miles. Another factor to be taken into account is that the Native locations or townships are usually some miles from the centre of the city causing considerable problems of transport as practically all the men and some of the women go daily to the city to work.

The local authority is responsible for the housing of the Natives who are working in the cities—except those who are employed on the mines and those who are accommodated as domestic servants—and they are housed usually on locations or townships where only Natives can live. This is a gradually developing policy but some of the Natives are still housed in areas adjoining or in the midst of European housing. I visited

the native locations at Johannesburg, Pretoria, Durban, East London and Cape Town and saw the accommodation provided for some hundreds of thousands of Natives—all types from the most squalid shanties to the most modern brick bungalows. Europeans are not normally allowed to visit the locations without a special pass and visits by general sightseers are strongly discouraged. At one time European social workers were able to go there quite freely but now in many of the areas, it is not considered wise, or sometimes even safe, for a European woman to go there alone. I was told that in this respect conditions have deteriorated in recent years and particularly very recently. It was suggested to me by one social worker that this is due in part to the feeling of unrest which it is said has been engendered in the minds of the Natives by the present Government policy but others would disagree and say it is because most of the native lawbreakers are to be found on the locations, particularly in the shanty town. Certainly statistics show that crime in the urban areas has increased considerably in recent years which has resulted in the overcrowding of native prisons and the need to send some of the inmates to prisons in the more rural parts of the country.

Johannesburg is the largest industrial city in South Africa and is also the largest Native city in the Union. In the gold mines 43,000 Natives are working and their housing and general welfare are the responsibility of the mining corporations. There has been a very small beginning in the provision of married quarters for Natives employed in the mines, but the vast majority sleep in dormitories in the various mine compounds; there were 2000 in the compound which my wife and I visited. The men come from the Reserves, sometimes thousands of miles away, on contracts for four, eight or 12 months after which they go home and may come back after a holiday with their families. The men are well fed; some cynics say unless they are well fed, like animals, they could not do the heavy work required of them. Those whom we saw seemed to be very cheerful and happy, enjoying games or music, watching the Native dancing (one of the most popular entertainments) or having their dinner. The men mostly find their own amusements and recreation in the compound and seldom take advantage of the passes which they may have to go to the city or visit one of the Native townships. The maintenance of good order does not seem to be difficult—the men are said to be “docile”; discipline is helped by having Native ‘policemen’ (in uniform but with no normal police powers) who are selected by the mine manager from the men themselves after consulting the men. In any compound there may be men from several different Native tribes so there is always at least one ‘policeman’ on duty from each tribe. The tribes practise *apartheid* amongst themselves and under no circumstances would those from different tribes be housed in the same dormitory. As has been truly said, the system is unnatural both for the men and for their families on the Reserves but the mines seem to have no difficulty in recruiting labour and

the men are able to save considerable sums to help their families at home, or, in the case of the younger men, to buy cattle so that they may buy wives, when they return to the Reserves. If a man wishes to send money to his family this is arranged through the mine office notifying the recruiting officer in the area where the family is living who can then collect the money. The mine office opens an account for each man from which he can draw money as he wishes and the balance is paid to him when he leaves. On the other hand he is quite free to draw his full pay weekly. The needs of the men in the compounds are met in various ways such as churches (although most of the men are said to be pagan), free medical services and hospital treatment; there are also club rooms and sports grounds. Welfare officers are employed who are responsible for looking after the general welfare of the men.

The welfare of the Natives employed in the mines is not therefore a responsibility of the city council but its Non-European Affairs Department has considerable responsibility for the housing and general welfare of the large numbers of Natives who do almost all the manual and domestic work in the city. I saw the housing provided on several of the Native locations or townships—some being 20 miles from the city. One of these has a population of some 100,000. On the new locations small brick houses with one or two bedrooms are being built at a cost of about £250; a prefabricated house with three bedrooms and a living room costs about the same. The rents vary from 17s. 4d. to £2 15s. 0d. a month and the older ones are much cheaper than those now being built which have better amenities, including indoor sanitation and water supply. As yet there has been no attempt to standardize the rents of the older and the newer houses. The rents are subsidized and involve a charge on the city council of some £250,000 a year. The Natives are being encouraged to build their own houses or have the houses built for them by Native labour; or the council is willing to build houses and sell to the Natives but they may not own the freehold. One new village is being provided entirely for owner-occupiers. There the Native is given a lease of a plot of land for 30 years and may have a loan of £250 or buy a house from the council under a hire purchase scheme for £272 on which the initial deposit is £20.

It is characteristic of the Native townships that in the same area and sometimes close to each other there may be small houses let at the lowest subsidized rents and large houses built by prosperous Natives for their own occupation. For instance I saw in one estate, where most of the houses were quite small, a few modern bungalows built by the owners and costing up to about £4,000.

I saw large housing schemes in progress also at Pretoria. There houses are being built by direct labour and not by contract which is the more usual practice. They are brick bungalows of 514 square feet and cost £180 each. Some are being rented to the Natives and many of them

are being bought under an instalment plan spread over a period of 30 years. All the labourers and artisans employed under this scheme are African Natives under a European supervisor and those who are skilled have been taught in trade schools set up for the purpose. Their wages are paid under an incentive system and start at £2 13s. 0d. a week rising to £6 3s. 0d. a week according to their skill and output; they work a five-day week of 45 hours, and have a paid annual holiday of seven days. Each man lays a minimum of 350 bricks a day up to a maximum of a thousand a day and many of them reach this standard.

Durban is another city where the housing of the Non-Europeans is causing considerable difficulty but here the problem is accentuated by the large number of Asiatics (mostly Indians) who must be housed on different sites from the African Natives. The Indians are the traders and it is only a few years ago that there were riots in the city caused by the African Natives attacking the Indians, and destroying some of their shops. The general scheme for the building of houses in this city area is similar to elsewhere both for renting and for owner-occupiers but land is available nearer to the city. The houses are being grouped in villages of between 400 and 500 houses. The full scheme contemplates 10,000 houses being so built. The houses have one, two or three bedrooms; a living room, a store room and a kitchen; some also have bathrooms. The average cost of each house is £470. The monthly rents vary from £2 11s. 0d. to £3 5s. 0d. Under the hire-purchase scheme the amounts payable vary from £2 19s. 6d. to £3 14s. 6d. a month.

The Department of Native Affairs has recently issued a direction to local authorities to charge economic rents from July 1, 1954, in the case of all households earning £15 a month. Many of the municipalities have objected and consider that, as in the past, the fixing of the rents should be a matter for the local authority. They describe this as another interference by the Government in local government affairs. It is suggested by those who object that it is impracticable to work such a scheme as reliable figures as to income are difficult to obtain. The sum of £15 is intended to include the total earnings of the head of the family, one half of the earnings of each child living at home, with a limit of £2 for each child, and the total earnings of any lodger with a limit of £4 a month for each. Local authorities seem to think that in any case the figure of £15 a month is too low. It is considered that on the suggested basis half the £15 would be taken by rent and food. Many of the Natives have considerable travelling expenses in addition. Under this scheme a tenant now paying 18s. 6d. a month for a sub-economic house would have to pay £2 3s. 6d. a month and if paying 35s. 9d. would have to pay £4 2s. 6d.

Male workers, whose families are not with them live in hostels; in Johannesburg there is accommodation in three areas for some 15,000 men, in addition to other accommodation for some 12,000 men who are

employed by the council. The newest hostel has some 3000 who pay a rent of 20s. a month. As they may be earning from £8 to £18 a month this rent seems to be quite reasonable but it must always be remembered in considering the financial position of men working in the city that if they are not living with their families they have families in the Native Reserves to whom they may be sending money or they will be saving money to take with them on their periodical return to their families—including often more than one wife each with a number of children. The men are accommodated in the hostels in dormitories, suitably furnished, and hot and cold water are available. There are large kitchens where the men do their own cooking and for this purpose several men often combine—but each man has a separate locker in which to store his cooking utensils and food. There is a recreation hall for boxing, concerts or other forms of recreation. Sometimes a voluntary organization, such as the Y.M.C.A., provides a canteen and runs entertainments.

Many Natives in all the large cities are living in squalid surroundings which may be compared with the conditions prevailing on the outskirts of some of the cities of North Africa. In one area some 5000 Natives are living in shacks which were built by the council to provide for the great influx of them during the war when, as in Britain, no proper new building was possible. The city council agree that this area must be cleared but as new houses are available many of the occupiers of the bad properties refuse to leave because they are only paying a rent of 10s. a month. There is another slum area which is causing the council considerable anxiety and is the subject of recent legislation. Here the land is owned by Indians who have built on the land miserable shanties which they rent to the Native Africans at high rates. The council are just as anxious to remedy this serious position as their critics but they have not only to re-house those living in slum conditions but also thousands of others who are overcrowded in good dwellings which they make into slums if the overcrowding is not stopped. Recent legislation aims at clearing the bad areas by the compulsory removal of some 70,000 Natives to new houses to be erected some miles from the city.

A local authority is not, however, free to build as many houses as it considers necessary or in respect of which materials and labour are available because the approval of the State Housing Commission must be obtained before any scheme can be commenced and the loans are provided from Government sources. Some local authorities, particularly Johannesburg's, feel that they are being too much restricted by the Government in this matter. Any complaints at the slowness of housing policy should therefore be made against the Government. Local authorities seem to feel that they are being unnecessarily frustrated. For instance, under a recent Treasury direction a local authority may not use its own funds to finance a new housing scheme which has been approved

in principle in anticipation of being able to recoup themselves out of the Government loan at a later date. I sensed a feeling of some resentment that municipalities are not receiving all the help which they think the Government should give them in the matter. The Johannesburg city council has stated publicly that it is determined to build all the houses possible with the money available and that the final responsibility for the provision of houses is therefore a matter for the Government because they must make the funds available. In another city I heard a similar complaint where the local authority could not use for Native housing improvements a sum of £30,000 which the council had in hand for this purpose but had to wait until sanction to the expenditure had been received from the Minister.

For some years there has been a statutory requirement that Natives in urban areas may only reside in locations, townships, their own villages or hostels. But certain Natives such as domestic servants, owners of property, those residing in mission houses, or who are registered parliamentary voters, are exempted from this provision. Domestic employees actually employed as domestic servants and for whom sleeping and sanitary accommodation is provided are also exempted. Under new legislation an employer will only be permitted to provide accommodation for servants on his premises if these are occupied exclusively for residential purposes or if they are of a class to be specified by the Minister or the local authority. In addition, an employer may be prohibited from housing more than five Natives on his premises or, where the Minister gives his consent, there may be only a certain number above five. This is intended to prevent a large number being housed in rooms at the top of a block of flats or an hotel. The new legislation has met with considerable opposition both from local authorities and from the owners of the flats and hotels because they say it will be difficult to get the necessary domestic help if some of their servants have to live on locations and come by train or bus from a distance from the city. In the case of a large house it is the usual practice for Native quarters to be provided in the grounds. Many Europeans have more than five servants living in this way. If the new legislation is enforced they will have to obtain a special approval and apparently it will not be possible for this to be given by the local authority. It is felt that greater freedom should be left to local authorities in local matters of this nature and that too much power is being concentrated in the Minister.

Recreational facilities and social amenities are provided on all locations and the playing fields are very large and well laid out. The social centres, dance halls, sports grounds and beer halls—for the sale of Kaffir beer only—are built by the council. The sports grounds are generally managed by clubs or committees of the Natives themselves under the general guidance of the welfare officers who are employed by the council and live on or near to the location. There are not many cinemas which cater

especially for Natives because it would not be economic to run them at prices which they could pay. Entertainment of this kind is therefore provided as one of the welfare activities of the city council sometimes free but usually at a small charge. Concerts, competitions, tribal dancing and art exhibitions are sponsored by the council and are very popular. Natives take eagerly to sport, both as performers and as spectators, and it seems a natural development from their strenuous and dramatic tribal dancing. The Johannesburg city council recently provided a sports ground exclusively for Natives at a cost of £150,000. Tennis is very popular and there is a flourishing tennis league. Both boys and girls play basket ball and football and there are youth clubs. Boxing clubs and P.T. clubs are very popular.

Gardening is encouraged and the Johannesburg city council also tries to make the new townships as attractive as possible. Garden clubs have a considerable membership and the members obtain seeds and manure at cheap rates. Garden prizes are offered in each township and there are annual exhibitions of flowers and vegetables.

Shops built by the council are rented to Natives which enable those living on the locations to make their purchases there instead of having to use Indian or European shops in the city. Most of the locations such as at Johannesburg are connected to the city by railway but otherwise bus transport is available. In some places I heard complaints of the long period which some Natives have to wait for transport to take them home after a day's work and also at the early hour at which a start had to be made in the morning. The need for improving the transport is however fully appreciated but will become more acute if the Government presses the present policy of requiring all Natives to live on townships or locations at some distance from the European quarters in the cities.

It is the practice on all locations to provide schools which, in the new areas, are usually adequate for the number of children living there but sometimes, as in Durban, the schools are overcrowded by children living in the shanty towns where there are no schools.

The Johannesburg city council maintains on several of the townships welfare centres which are associated with one large central clinic. One of the services provided is the health examination of women proposed to be employed as domestic servants or nurses. A full out-patients service is available with home visits by doctors and nurses. There are district midwifery services and ante-natal and post-natal clinics. There are also child welfare and tuberculosis clinics. All the services provided by the clinics are free, including medicines and preventive foods. The only charge is a fee of one shilling for a first visit by the doctor to the house to discourage unnecessary calls. Crèches are sometimes provided for the daily care of the young children of mothers who are working in the city. Similarly free hospital treatment is provided generally for those on Native locations in other cities. Health centres have been

established in various parts of the Union and from the outset the Government recognized the need for training the staff in a large centre at Durban, which includes a main health centre with subsidiaries elsewhere in the city. Here there are teams of workers—doctors, nurses and health educationalists—who are working together with the object of raising the health standard of those of the various communities—both African and Asian and some of the poorer Europeans. It is the aim to adapt European methods. There are various clinics at the centre including a maternity and child welfare clinic and my wife and I found it most interesting to see a group of African women, who after attending the clinic, were sitting in a group talking amongst themselves about their problems with a nurse and with Native health educationalists listening and advising. The staff include Europeans, African Natives and Asians—all working together freely and happily. But although the European and the Native may be side by side at their work *Apartheid* is practised socially because it is a Government institution and, contrary to the wishes of most of the staff themselves, the Europeans and the Non-Europeans have their meals in different rooms. When my wife and I had morning tea with the staff it had to be with the Europeans; the Non-Europeans were having theirs in another room. A large number of Non-Europeans visit the centre for treatment and advice and the doctors and the health educationalists each have a group of families which they visit. There are witch doctors in every Native community but we learnt that at Durban some of them are inclined to co-operate with the health centre and have sent to the clinic cases which they knew were beyond their powers. Strangely, some of the witch doctors have themselves gone to the clinic for advice.

The arrangements which I have described at Johannesburg and Durban are typical to a varying degree of other urban areas but there are some special educational or social schemes which are of interest. For instance at East London there is, on the native location, a hostel for African Native children, mostly boys, which is intended for those from the ages of nine to 21 but sometimes they are both younger and older. The hostel is partly for children committed by the court and partly for the detention of those arrested by the police who must go before a magistrate within 24 hours. This hostel is supervised by a voluntary organization but the cost is met by the Native Affairs Department of the Union Government. Until recently the provincial authority was responsible for the hostel but, as in the case of educational arrangements for Natives generally, it has recently been transferred to the Government. At this hostel there is a Native staff with an African couple in charge.

Another special provision is an old people's home on the Native location at East London where there is a trained Native as a matron with an all-Native staff under the general supervision of the welfare officer on the location. It is only recently that provision of this kind has been

found to be necessary as the African Natives on the Reserve have a considerable sense of family responsibility, but it was suggested to me that when they become urbanized they tend to take less interest in their old folk.

One matter which is causing much controversy is the new arrangement whereby the responsibility for Native education has been transferred from the provincial authorities, which are still responsible for European education, to the Department of Native Affairs. The reason put forward by the Government for this alteration is that it is a mistake to try to educate the Natives like the Europeans and that they should be taught by teachers who understand their own problems. On this controversy I can only say that both points of view seem to be equally convincing to a non-South African when put by those who hold these views and that, as I said at the outset, it must be for the South Africans and not for people some thousands of miles away to say which view is correct. The Government take the view, and in this are supported strongly by the Dutch Reformed Church, that Natives have not yet reached a stage of culture which makes it desirable for them to be educated as Europeans; that they should be educated up to the proper standard but not so that they are capable of taking the place of Europeans.

I hope I have been able to show that much is being done for the Natives and particularly for those in the urban areas but that much more needs to be done. Is the present policy on the right lines? Is the action now being taken by the Government—repressive in some ways—going to cause unrest? Or are the Natives going to feel that the Government (especially the Minister of Native Affairs) are whole-heartedly doing all that is possible in their interest within the financial and other means available? These are important questions of which the answer may not be known until some years ahead and certainly cannot be given by a visitor to South Africa from Britain.

(Mr. John Moss, C.B.E., a barrister, has had considerable experience of the British social services, and among his surveys of those of the Commonwealth this report on his South African tour is the most recent.)

CAN WAR BE AVOIDED ?

BY VISCOUNT AMBERLEY

(In this series of previously published FORTNIGHTLY articles these have been chosen for a number of reasons: either they review a now famous book, or their reviewer afterwards became famous, or he was already a famous figure speaking his mind about another equally famous, or about one who was later to be so. A further claim to inclusion is made for the treatment of a subject—then of pressing topical interest—which could be applied to, or point the moral of, or throw light on a problem of to-day. Although it is expected that their lessons will be instructive, this is incidental to the object of compiling a diverting anthology even when the writers are at their most serious.)

The first part of these extracts from an article published 83 years ago, outlining a scheme for abolishing war through the agency of a league of nations, was reprinted in the last number of THE FORTNIGHTLY.

* * * *

THE Federal Council could not adequately fulfil its office without the extreme power of declaring war. In the first place, what else can be equally effective as a means of preventing war when declared, or likely otherwise to be declared, by an aggressive power? Confident in its strength, and regardless of the opinion of its neighbours, such a power is very unlikely to listen to any arguments not accompanied by threats. In the second place, what else can be so likely to bring war to a speedy end, if it has actually begun? The people assailed would find itself defended by such a rampart as no single nation could think of assaulting with any chance of success. War, under such conditions, would be unlikely to occur; if it did occur, it would be of short duration. Moreover, it would be still further mitigated by the circumstance that any war undertaken by the Federation must be of a purely defensive, or more properly, preventive character. From its composition and character the Federation could never aim at its own aggrandisement at the expense of any country. Possessing no territory in its common character, it could never desire to take it from others. Military glory would be indifferent to so heterogeneous a body, and its very strength would lift it above such considerations. Its only object would be to remove the strain upon its resources as soon as possible by making peace. On receiving ample guarantees that the unjust attack would not be repeated, the work of the Federation, so far as that work was of a belligerent character, would be over. As an illustration of this sort of preventive warfare, the guarantee given to Belgium by three

neutral powers in the present war may be referred to. In this case it was proposed that in the event of attack, Belgium should be defended by these guarantors, but without their taking part in the general operations of the war. In short, Belgium would have been protected, but no part would have been taken in the invasion of France or the sieges of her cities. This guarantee was completely successful in assuring the public mind that if any danger had threatened Belgium, that danger was now past...

... If the Council by its wisdom inspired confidence in its constituents; if its members were superior to petty national jealousies; if its conduct evinced a single regard for the amity of nations and an earnest wish to administer impartial justice among them, there is no reason why its decrees should not be as promptly obeyed as Acts of Parliament among ourselves. If once it gained this high reputation—and there seems no reason why it should not—the remnants of the old anarchy would disappear. Nations would feel as secure in regard to other nations as each of us feels in his own home in regard to his neighbours. The wars, then, which the Federation might have to wage must be looked upon as transitory evils arising from the impossibility of at once emerging from our present barbarous civilization to a higher state.

While, however, the Council would prohibit unwarrantable aggression, it must not be supposed that it would have nothing to do but to uphold the *status quo* throughout the world. Such an attempt would inevitably fail, for it would ignore the natural laws which compel the progressive expansion of some races at the expense of others. Cases occur in which a transfer of territory is desirable, as recently happened in Italy, when Victor Emmanuel took possession of the Estates of the Church. It would be the duty of the Council to deal with such cases on their merits.

... How, for example, should the Council behave in such a case as that of the late war? Had France declared war, instead of bringing her grievances before the Council, her declaration must immediately have been met by a counter-declaration on the part of the Federated powers that they would oppose, *vi et armis*, any attack directed against Prussia. It is all but certain that such an announcement would have prevented the war altogether. Mad and reckless as the conduct of Napoleon was, it is barely conceivable that even he would have hurled his troops against the united forces of North Germany, Austria, Russia, and Great Britain, to say nothing of Italy and Spain, which would have attacked his southern frontiers. We may, therefore, safely assume that no war would have occurred. But, as we are bound to contemplate every possibility, let us imagine for a moment that the French had persisted in their bellicose ardour, and had met the allied forces in battle. Since the Germans alone sufficed to defeat the armies of France, it is plain that their overthrow by the allies must have been still more complete and crushing. Their aggressive movement would have been repelled, and their armies,

we may suppose, surrounded and taken prisoners, as at Sedan and at Metz. But the danger of an invasion of Germany having been once averted, the objects of the Federation would have been accomplished, and there could have been no further obstacle to the conclusion of peace. In no case could it have entered into the designs of the Federation to invade France, crushing its civil population beneath the iron tramp of hostile troops. Germany could have had no excuse for insisting on an accession of territory, for her frontier would have been amply guaranteed by the support of her allies. Besides, having received the support of other countries in repelling invasion, she must needs have acknowledged the right of those countries to a voice in determining the conditions of peace . . . The ex-Emperor Napoleon, had the Federation existed, should have been found guilty, and condemned to whatever penalty his judges might conceive to be adequate to his offence. If any proper sentiment existed among nations as to the awful criminality of causing an unnecessary war, no punishment could possibly be deemed too severe. Napoleon's crime was of the deepest dye. Not only had he received no provocation, but he himself actually gave it. He stimulated the warlike passions of France and Prussia. He deliberately refused to be content with the concession of all he had demanded of Prussia, and put forth a further demand of so outrageous a character that it could not possibly be agreed to. The throne which he had won by bloodshed, required further bloodshed to sustain it; and as he had not shrunk before from the massacre of Frenchmen, so he did not now recoil from bidding Frenchmen and Germans massacre each other . . .

While the existence of the Federal Council would have been thus beneficial in the most recent instance, its action would in all probability have been equally efficacious in determining other European difficulties which have arisen during the course of this century. For example, it may safely be concluded that Russia would have ventured upon no aggression in Turkey had she known that the whole force of the Federation was ready to oppose her. The German-Danish question would have presented little difficulty. By listening to the conflicting claims of Germany and Denmark, and at the same time carefully ascertaining the feelings of the inhabitants of Schleswig-Holstein, a satisfactory boundary-line could have been drawn without the humiliation actually suffered by Denmark. The Italian question, though more difficult, would also have been capable of adjustment by the Council without the necessity of war; for if the Emperor of Austria and the King of Piedmont had brought their respective claims before the Council, that body considering the known wishes of the population, must have declined to support the Austrian cause. In any war between these powers—no matter which of them began it—equity would have compelled them to treat Austria as the aggressor, so long as she occupied Italian soil. The knowledge of this would in all probability have induced the peaceable cession of her

Italian provinces to Victor Emmanuel. The Federation, in short, could have done by moral authority what the ex-Emperor Napoleon and his Italian allies did by war. Like reasons would have effected the evacuation of Rome by France . . . It may be asked, whence are the new forces to come which are to induce powerful and military nations to submit to the control of a heterogeneous body, in which, from the very necessities of the case, they will lose the advantage of their strength and their mighty armaments? Or what is to prevent them, even if they do enter into such a League, from breaking loose from it as soon as it suits their convenience? And if one nation were not strong enough to overcome the League, would it not necessarily be dissolved if several of the major States resolved, with a view to some iniquitous aggression, to repudiate its control? Such machines (it may be contended) can never be stronger than the public opinion that works them, and what we need is the transformation of this opinion into something more equitable and lofty—a transformation not to be effected by an artificial organization. Nations would still be guided by their interests, and would break away from federal obligations or decrees as they now do from treaties, if the inconvenience of obeying them were greater than that of evading them. If there were a lawless spirit in Europe no federal body could repress it; while if there were not, the Council would be of very secondary importance, and might, indeed, be altogether needless. Again, the Council must be able to agree upon some common moral rules; but what would these be? Not the perpetual obligation of treaties; not the illegitimacy of conquest; not the right of each country to select its rulers; for each of these rules would condemn the practice of one or more of the great powers. Upon what general principles then could such an international parliament found its action?

. . . War being a result of malignant passions, it is plain that nothing can prevent it completely but an improvement in morals. In the absence of a strong moral sentiment against fighting on the part of the majority of mankind, there can be no specific to stop them from occasionally gratifying their natural ferocity. In speaking of what the Federation and its representative assembly might accomplish, I have thought myself at liberty to presuppose this improvement. And I do not admit that this is by any means a rash or unjustifiable assumption. On the contrary, it seems to me that unless the progress of the human race should come to an unaccountable standstill, the moral reprobation with which indulgence of the combative and destructive propensities of our nature is regarded must gain in intensity and in generality. Certain it is that all progress hitherto has been favourable to, and indeed has largely consisted in the growth of such a sentiment. Not only have all well-ordered societies suppressed the acts of violence, plunder, and rapine which were formerly common between individuals or sections of the community, but war itself, though still tolerated, is regarded with far greater

horror and aversion now than it formerly was . . . War cannot by its nature be anything but utterly cruel and barbarous, and if we want to prevent cruelty and barbarity we must check them at the fountain-head. Can it be doubted that this is the conclusion to which modern feeling irresistibly and inevitably tends? There is plainly visible a growing detestation of the odious massacres which, from time to time, disgrace the world, and a growing desire to discover some honourable means of doing without them.

Perhaps, however, it may be thought that this argument renders the whole of the foregoing proposals superfluous; for as soon as nations desire peace with sufficient fervour they will have it, even without the machinery of a Federal Council. In a certain sense this is true, and I fully believe that the condition of universal and permanent peace will sooner or later arrive, whether or not there should be established a formal league in order to secure it. But this result will not be attained without human co-operation. Progress is the joint result of the efforts of numerous human beings striving in the same direction. Thus, in the present case, those who wish to see war superseded must labour together in order to convert others to their opinions. And I am convinced that they will labour far more effectually and usefully if they have a definite proposal to make in lieu of it, than if they confine themselves to general denunciations of its iniquity. Men listen to these denunciations as they do to sermons; with respect, perhaps with agreement, but without perceiving that there is anything to be actually done. War, they admit, is a great curse, but how are they to prevent it? Now I hold that the ends of the peace party in the several countries where it exists will be sooner and more easily gained if they can point out that there *are* other ways by which nations can determine matters of difference with honour and continue to exert a legitimate influence on one another . . . What guarantee have we that the Federal Council would decide justly between the vast interests that would struggle for the mastery within it? I reply that we have no absolute guarantee, but that, presupposing, as we must, an earnest wish to preserve peace (without which no council could exist at all), the probability is that it would act with as much regard to justice as any other representative assembly . . . As a good many very unjust and very bad Acts of Parliament are preferable to rebellion, so a considerable degree of imperfection in the decrees of the International Parliament would be a cheap price to pay for our deliverance from the enormous injustice always involved in war. If only the people were determined to have peace, their delegates in the council would find means to preserve it, and would avoid any such gross departure from equity as to imperil its continuance . . .

Undoubtedly, if two or three of the large powers were resolutely bent upon a course of violence and aggression against a neighbour, they might break up the league in order to carry out their policy. But I fail to see

that this constitutes an objection to the establishment of such a league . . . To act aggressively and perfidiously as well is more difficult than to act aggressively only. Hence, though it is true that the league might thus be destroyed, as any civil government might be destroyed by the insurrection of the majority of its subjects, this does not prove that the experiment ought not to be tried, or that if tried, it would be wholly useless.

Lastly, there is no obvious necessity for the establishment of any common principles of international ethics at the very outset of the Council's deliberations. Seeing how opinion varies from age to age, it would probably be even inexpedient to lay down any abstract principles to which the members must agree, and which, like the Thirty-nine Articles of religion, might possibly remain in existence only to hamper and perplex them, long after the riper judgment of posterity had advanced to something better. The delegates to the Federal Council would be instructed by their constituents that it was their duty to preserve peace; and subject to this general and paramount end, the larger the liberty allowed them, the better, in all probability, would their functions be discharged. Rules to govern the relations of independent States towards each other would then be found, as soon as the condition of public opinion rendered it possible to arrive at a common understanding. Rules for the conduct of governments in their internal relations it would be beyond the province of the Council to frame at all.

Many former small communities, now united under a single rule, remain constantly at peace. Ancient Greece was divided into numerous little republics, which were often at enmity with each other; ancient Rome carried on long hostilities with its Italian neighbours. In the Middle Ages there existed several independent and hostile powers in Italy. England and Wales were not always friendly; England and Scotland were once inveterate foes. In Germany, unity has been but recently achieved, and war, which might formerly have occurred, and did very frequently occur, between its separate factions, is now no longer possible within the limits of the German Confederation.

Nor is it a sufficient reply to this argument to say that in all these cases peace has only been secured by the union of the hostile communities under a common ruler, who has had at his command such a preponderant force as to compel the turbulent to abstain from further quarrels. Whence could the preponderant force of these rulers have come but from the desire of the several sections of their empire to maintain friendly relations? Could the King of Italy keep in check the passions of his people if Florence and Pisa, Genoa and Venice, and all the other important towns of that peninsula were still inflamed by their ancient rivalries? And if the enmities of Greeks, Italians, Germans, and Britons are found to vanish under the influence of union under a central authority, why may not those of these various races among each other? They are surely not so widely separated in feelings, manners, laws, or religion,

that it would be utterly hopeless to create among them too a sense of intimacy and sympathy which, a few generations hence, would render a war between France and Germany, or England and Russia, as monstrous and inconceivable as it would be now between England and Scotland.

Should it be thought, however, that the overwhelming power which a single government can generally bring to bear against refractory subjects—a power greater in proportion than the Federation could command against rebellious States—still vitiates the comparison, there is another analogy which is wholly free from this defect. It is that of the Boards of Arbitration which have been found so eminently successful in certain trades in obviating strikes. Here there is absolutely no physical force to support the moral force exerted by the common authority. Masters and workmen might either of them at any moment refuse to abide by an adverse decision, and break up the Boards. But it is not found that they do this. The men, being represented in equal numbers, and knowing that their interests will be fairly considered, no longer resort to strikes—which are in trade the equivalent of war—but are content to be ruled by a body in which the claims of both sides are fully heard and amicably adjusted. The result, it is obvious, would never have been obtained by any number of speeches or writings showing the folly of strikes on general grounds, or exposing the injury they do to the workmen who resort to them. What was required in order to put a stop to them was that some one should propose a practical substitute. It would be the same with nations . . .

. . . The habit of peace would grow upon men, as does, unhappily, the habit of war. If an entire generation could grow up without having ever seen war, it would in all probability be thought of with such an intense aversion, that nations would recoil in horror from sending forth their sons, either to massacre, devastate, and plunder others, or to be themselves killed upon the field of battle or sent back mangled and shattered to their homes. Peace would have become habitual, and rulers or public men who tried to break it would be looked upon, not only abroad, but in their native countries, with the detestation they deserve. Armies and navies will then become useless burdens. The scientific skill which now employs itself in the multiplication and refinement of engines for the rapid destruction of human beings will turn to worthier pursuits. We shall dwell, not only in actual tranquillity, but—what is second only in importance—in security, confidence, and mutual friendship.

Doubtless all this can only be the slow growth of time—how slow it is impossible for any one now living to predict. But this does not prevent us from beginning to move towards the distant goal. Let Europe, at least—Europe, which is the centre whence civilization, knowledge, and humanity are diffused—be diligently urged to commence the work . . .

May, 1871.

THE ATTACK ON MONOPOLY

BY W. T. WELLS, M.P.

SINCE 1945, it has been common ground between the political parties that, to put it at its lowest, the rôle of the State in economic affairs is not likely to diminish; and it is also common ground that this rôle is not to be exercised exclusively by means of nationalization. And while certain forms of State intervention in economic life are generally controversial, such as nationalization itself and the establishment of development councils, others continue to remain wholly outside the area of political dispute. An example of this latter class is the work of the Monopolies and Restrictive Practices Commission, set up under the Monopolies and Restrictive Practices (Inquiry and Control) Act, 1948.

The objects with which the Act was introduced and the Commission set up were largely agreed between the parties. "We cannot afford" said Mr. Harold Wilson, then President of the Board of Trade in his speech on Second Reading,* "the restrictive practices that grew up on both sides of industry between the two wars . . . we cannot as a nation afford restrictive practices if they increase our costs abroad, if they prevent the fullest development of inventions and new techniques, or reduce output, or maintain prices at an excessive level to our consumers at home; or afford practices which deny to the new and more efficient producer a means of entering an industry, or to the inventive or progressive producers a chance of expanding." Mr. Wilson went on to explain, by quoting with approval a Conservative statement on the subject, that labour practices were excluded from the proposed legislation "not because restrictive labour practices are unimportant, but because they cannot be appropriately dealt with by the same methods of legislation as restrictive business practices." Sir David Maxwell Fyfe, in opening the debate for the Conservative Opposition, stated: "In 1945 the Conservative party in the election manifesto of that year expressed its wish for an inquiry on the lines that are now suggested." Later, controversy arose on the question whether the Act should apply to nationalized industries, and on some other less important questions, but on fundamentals the parties were, and still remain, united on this matter.

The Commission's main terms of reference are provided by sections two and three of the Act. These provide that where it appears to the Board of Trade that conditions to which the Act applies—an expression

* Parliamentary Debates Vol. 449. col. 2020: April 22, 1948.

explained in section three—prevail respecting the supply of goods of any description, or exports of goods of any description from the United Kingdom, the Board may refer the matter to the Commission for investigation and report. There is a proviso to the first sub-section the effect of which is to exclude any reference in respect of a nationalized industry or any other form of monopoly created by statute. The second sub-section in effect directs the Commission, at the request of the Board of Trade, to give the Board any information in their possession or power as to any monopoly or suspected monopoly.

Section three defines the conditions to which the Act applies in relation to the supply of goods. These prevail in respect of the supply of goods of any description where at least one-third of such goods supplied in the United Kingdom or any substantial part thereof are supplied by or to any one person (including in that term a company) or by or to two or more interconnected companies or by or to two or more persons who so conduct their affairs as to prevent or restrict competition in connection with the production or supply of such goods; or where any agreements are in operation, the result of which is that in the United Kingdom or any substantial part thereof such goods are not supplied at all. Section four defines, in broadly similar terms, the meaning of the words, "conditions to which this Act applies", in relation to processing, and section five, again in terms generally similar in relation to exports.

The Act provides for two types of references for investigation and report. In one type these are confined to the facts, and in the other the Commission, in addition to dealing with these questions, has to report whether the conditions in question or the things done operate, or may be expected to operate, against the public interest. In the latter type of reference it is open to the Board of Trade to confine the investigation, after the facts have been found, to the question whether things specified in the reference are done as a result of, or for the purpose of preserving those conditions, and if so, whether or not they operate, or may be expected to operate, against the public interest. "The public interest" is nowhere strictly defined, but section 14 authorizes the Commission to take into account "all matters which appear in the circumstances to be relevant" and directs that "regard shall be had to the need, consistently with the general economic position of the United Kingdom, to achieve

- (a) the production, treatment and distribution by the most efficient and economical means of goods of such types and qualities, in such volume and at such prices as will best meet the requirements of home and overseas markets;
- (b) the organization of industry and trade in such a way that their efficiency is progressively increased and new enterprise is encouraged;
- (c) the fullest use and best distribution of men, materials and industrial capacity in the United Kingdom; and
- (d) the development of technical improvements and the expansion of existing markets and the opening up of new markets.

There are two further clauses that require special consideration. One is section 15, which empowers the Board of Trade to require the Com-

mission to submit a report on the general effect on the public interest of practices of a specified class, being practices which in the opinion of the Board are commonly adopted as a result of, or for the purpose of preserving, monopoly conditions as defined by the Act. At present the Commission have before them a requirement from the Board of Trade for a report under this section on the general effect on the public interest of certain widely prevalent practices whose general effect is to involve agreement amongst a number of traders to discriminate in favour of or against a defined class of customers. The other is section 10, which empowers certain "competent authorities"—in effect, the Government Department principally concerned with an industry which has been the subject of an investigation and report—to give effect to the Commission's findings by making an order that may

- (a) declare it to be unlawful to make or to carry out any agreements or arrangements specified in the order;
- (b) require the determination of such agreements or arrangements;
- (c) declare it to be unlawful to withhold, from any persons specified or described, any supplies or services specified or described;
- (d) declare any specified preferences to be unlawful;
- (e) declare it to be unlawful to require as a condition of supplying of goods or services to any person the buying of any other goods or the making of any payment or the doings of any other matter specified in the order.

These declarations and requirements are enforceable by civil, not criminal, process.

The Act prescribes the procedure to be followed, empowering the Commission, among other things, to compel the attendance of any witness or the production of any document, and further provides for the membership of the Commission. There is also provision for the presentation to Parliament of an annual report.

Before leaving the legal machinery it is important to notice the Monopolies and Restrictive Practices Commission Act, 1953, which provided for the reorganization of the Commission by adding to its membership and so enabling it to increase its output by pursuing, through sub-committees, a number of different inquiries at the same time; and by giving an element of permanence and continuity among the senior members. Since the passing of this Act, Mr. Scott Cairns, Q.C., has been appointed chairman—a permanent and pensionable post; and provision was made by this Act, which marks the recognition of the importance of the Commissions' work after five years' experience of its operation, for the appointment of three permanent and pensionable deputy-chairmen.

Having summarized, if in a rather bald, crude and restricted fashion, the machinery of the Monopolies Acts, it is now possible to come to grips with the two questions it is the object of this article to answer: how have the Acts been worked and what part is the Commission likely to play in our economic affairs?

The Commission has produced eight reports:

- 1950-51 On the Supply of Cast Iron and Rainwater Goods.
- 1950-51 On the Supply of Dental Goods.
- 1950-51 On the Supply of Electric Lamps.
- 1951-52 On the Supply of Insulated Wires and Cables.
- 1951-52 On the Supply of Insulin.
- 1952-53 On the Supply and Export of Matches and the Supply of Match Making Machinery.
- 1952-53 On the Supply of Imported Timber.
- 1952-54 On the Process of Calico Printing.

In the preparation of each of these reports, more or less the same procedure, which has become a standardized technique of investigation, has been followed;* although this is "no more than a pattern to which the inquiries conform in varying degrees, their [the inquiries] subject matter and circumstances being much too diverse for any stereotyped plan to apply to them." In the first place an inquiry falls into two distinct stages: first, ascertainment of the facts and, second, considering the bearing of the facts on the public interest. As soon as a reference is received from the Board of Trade, three steps are taken: the Commission advertise their readiness to receive in writing the views of anyone interested in the inquiry; the staff compile such general information on the industry concerned as is available from published sources; and the principal trade associations in the industry are invited to an informal meeting with the Commission at which the general lines of the Commission's procedure are explained. After this stage the work of taking evidence and extracting facts, which may last for considerably longer than a year, proceeds. Two lines of inquiry are normally followed, one from the trade associations of the industry concerned, the other from complainants, users, independent concerns, Government Departments and other bodies which may be affected by the practices under investigation or be able to throw light on the circumstances of the industry. Such evidence may be collected either orally or in writing. As soon as this work has begun to reveal the general picture of the industry, a third line of inquiry is usually opened up by means of an accountant's investigations into the financial circumstances of the industry. Then, when the facts have been ascertained, while the staff under the supervision of the Commission start to prepare the descriptive chapters of the report, the Commission themselves conduct an investigation of the public interest aspects of the inquiry. For this purpose the Commission inform the trade associations of their provisional conclusions on the facts and usually indicate to them some ways in which their practices may be held to be against the public interest in order to help them to focus their case. At the same time the Commission invite the associations to attend a hearing at which the effect of the practices on the public interest will be argued. At this hearing the associations are generally represented by counsel. The associations' case on the public interest is then submitted to the

* This fact is confirmed by the Commission's own evidence before the House of Commons' Select Committee on Estimates. (Cmd. 177 of 1953); and this part of this article is based on the evidence contained in Annex 2 to this report.

Commission and replies are given to any questions which the Commission may desire to put. After discussion among themselves, the Commission then agree on their recommendation and the final draft of their report.

Turning to the published reports themselves, which cannot here be examined in detail, the first conclusion that emerges from their study is that they are documents of a high order, prepared in a judicial spirit, with no predisposition either to whitewash or to indict. In one industry investigated, namely, the supply of insulin, the Commission found that although monopolistic practices existed they did not operate, and the Commission did not anticipate that they would operate, against the public interest. In each of the other industries investigated up to date, the Commission have found serious grounds of criticism from the point of view of the public interest.

The second conclusion that emerges from following the history of the reports after their publication, which can best be traced by study of the Commission's several annual reports, is that they are far from being dead letters. The receipt of a report from the Commission by the Board of Trade has in each instance been announced in the House of Commons by the President of the Board, who has explained to the House to what extent he accepts the Commission's findings and recommendations. Each such report has been accepted by the Board in principle, and rejection of the Commission's findings has been confined to questions of detail. The publication of the first report, that on the supply of dental goods, was followed some six months later (on July 2, 1951) by the making by the Minister of Health and the Secretary of State for Scotland of the Monopolies and Restrictive Practices (Dental Goods) Order, 1951.* This made it unlawful to make or carry out any agreement that is intended or likely to have the effect of limiting the number of persons carrying on business in the United Kingdom as suppliers of dental goods; to make unlawful any agreement for the minimum price of dental goods sold by retail in the United Kingdom; and these provisions were applied to such agreements made before the Order came into operation. Further, this Order made it unlawful for any person to procure any other persons to agree to withhold or threaten to withhold dental goods from any supplier of dental goods on the ground that that supplier had sold dental goods by retail in the United Kingdom at a price less than that indicated to him. Since this drastic interference with liberty of contract no further Order under the Act of 1948 has been made; but this has been because, with the example of the Dental Goods Order before them, the trade interests concerned have gone very far indeed to meet the requirements of the Board of Trade by negotiation and agreement, even in so extreme an example as the recommendation of the report on the supply and export of matches and matchmaking machinery,

* S.I. 1951. No. 1200.

where the changes suggested will lead to a fundamental alteration in the structure of the industry in this country and in its relations with a great international organization, the Swedish Match.

It is significant, in this connection, to study an answer given by Mr. Sandys, the Minister of Supply, to Mr. Swingler, about the Commission's report on wires and cables: *

"After a thorough examination of the complicated issue involved, the Government have asked the trade associations concerned to give an assurance that they will bring their arrangements into conformity with these conclusions [the Commission's] not later than 31st December next . . . If the trade associations concerned are prepared to give the assurances asked for, it will not be necessary to make an Order under Section 10 of the Monopolies Act." No warning could be plainer.

The Board of Trade and the Commission, acting together, have powers not only to probe into the most intimate details affecting the businesses which the Commission investigate but have, in addition, power to put an end to arrangements which restrict competition, keep up prices, or otherwise act against the public interest. They have exercised such powers in the past and have shown that they are willing, if necessary, to use them in the future. The Commission is in process of so reorganizing itself as greatly to extend the scope of its activities. It is probable that, within the next five or at most ten years, an immense area of the industrial field will have been subject to investigation and have been moved, by one form of pressure or another, to modify time-honoured practices and arrangements.† Cumulatively, the effect of such a process will be great, and there can be little doubt but that it will be beneficial. Few who shared in the enthusiasm (or, amongst Conservatives, gloom) of those days in July 1945, when the Labour Party found itself for the first time in undisputed control of the country, would have anticipated that such a measure as the Monopolies and Restrictive Practices Act would prove one of the most far-reaching laws that a House of Commons with a strong Labour majority would enact; probably even Mr. Harold Wilson himself would not be one of those few; but so it may well be, none the less.

(The author has been the Member of Parliament for Walsall since 1945.)

* Parliamentary Debates. 1954 H. of C. Vol. 527 cols. 144-147.

† As at January 1, 1954, the Commission had in hand the following references in addition to the Section 15 reference mentioned above:—

The supply of certain electrical and allied machinery and plant and exports of such products from the United Kingdom.

The supply of pneumatic tyres and exports thereof from the United Kingdom.

The supply in the Greater London area of new buildings costing more than £1,000 each to construct.

The reference on the supply of various semi-manufactures of copper and copper-based alloys and export of such products from the United Kingdom.

The supply of linoleum.

The supply in Central Scotland of sand and gravel suitable for building or civil engineering purposes.

JOHN MORLEY IN POLITICS

By M. R. D. FOOT

JOHN MORLEY had already reached his middle forties, and established his reputation as an author, a perspicacious critic, and a powerful journalist in the radical interest, when he entered the House of Commons early in 1883. Twice before he had stood for Parliament, in years of liberal victory, but without success. What he saw at close quarters in the '70's of "life behind the scenes in the House of Commons" made him, for a time, "feel it is no place for me." For 15 years, which ended in 1882, he edited the radical FORTNIGHTLY; and when he took on the editorship of the *Pall Mall Gazette* in 1880 he made that radical too. In the end, his entry into Parliament was somewhat abrupt. One of the two Liberal members for Newcastle-on-Tyne suddenly resigned, and Morley was whisked through all the formalities of being adopted as Liberal candidate in his place within 30 hours of the announcement, and returned without difficulty. This sudden adoption was prearranged. The retiring member (who died soon afterwards) was younger brother to Sir Charles Dilke, the close friend and political mentor of Joseph Chamberlain; and Morley and Chamberlain lived at this time in brotherly intimacy. Morley's return for Newcastle helped Chamberlain in two ways. In Parliament it offered him a convenient channel through which to urge a more radical course on the Government to which he and Dilke belonged; and locally at Newcastle it maintained the supremacy of the Liberal caucus, the great organized party machine which was Chamberlain's most positive contribution to English politics—for the Newcastle caucus had gone to war with the other Liberal member, the independent radical Joseph Cowen, and unless a caucus candidate could be brought promptly to the starting post it was likely that another rich and popular local manufacturer, like Cowen a man with a mind of his own, would put himself forward. The choice for the caucus seemed, in fact, to be: nominate a safe man, quickly; or lose all control in a great industrial city.

In this not over-elegant way Morley stepped forward onto the political stage. Yet he, emphatically, was a man with a mind of his own; as befitted one who had written a decade before of his "absolutely unalloyed veneration and attachment" to John Stuart Mill, whose creed in politics might be summed up as the plea that every man, on every issue, should consult his own conscience and the rules of right reason,

following where they led him, and following no other guide. Morley did not catch with any special adroitness the tone and temper of the Commons—he spoke with more telling fire at great meetings outside; indeed to feel his full oratorical powers you had to hear him, not on the platform, nor in the House, but privately, dining with a small company of trusted friends. There, he was often brilliant. In Parliament he was effective enough; and without ever overwhelming that trickiest of audiences, he managed as a rule to hold its ear. His own sincerity, coupled with his powerful command of language, would in any case have brought him notice; they combined with his previous reputation as a writer, and the backing of the two radical ministers as well as the party machine, to bring him straight into prominence. Already in the autumn of 1883 he found himself presiding at Leeds over the conference of the left wing of the Liberal party, where John Bright first adumbrated the proposal that a time-limit should be placed on the veto of the House of Lords. During the next year, Morley was conspicuous among the radical assailants of Gladstone's Egyptian policy, the men who were so far from thinking that an expedition to relieve Gordon at Khartoum should be hastened that they maintained there should be no British troops in the Nile Valley at all; and he warmly supported Chamberlain's attacks on the Lords, who ought, he said, to be "mended or ended". In 1885 he wrote much of the anonymous *Radical Programme* of which Chamberlain signed the preface, an appeal to the electorate (which had just been much enlarged) to turn away from Whigs and Tories alike towards a radical policy for land, labour, church, and schools.

But the break with Chamberlain was near. It came in mid-winter, over Ireland—a subject which had preoccupied Morley ever since he had visited America during the Fenian year of 1867. Though the Irish voted against him at Newcastle in his first two elections there, he was not so small-minded as to abandon his conviction that the government of Ireland from Westminster, through Dublin Castle, was an evil that ought to be removed, and replaced by some system that gave the people of Ireland more say in their own fate; and here he fell foul of Chamberlain. The radical wing of the Liberal party was itself divided, in the convulsion of 1886 that broke the party up; Dilke's influence was accidentally abated on the eve of the crisis, and Morley and Chamberlain found themselves on opposite sides. Personally, they remained on friendly terms for some years more; but neither could convince the other of the grandeur of his own, or the smallness of his friend's, view of Ireland's destiny. 'Empire' was a word with few good connotations for Morley, and the appeal of 'self-government' was (it turned out) comparatively weak for Chamberlain in this particular case.

Morley passed at once under the spell of the only British statesman of the day of greater force than his former master. He forgot that in 1873 he had written (in these pages) of Gladstone's mind as a "busy

mint of logical counterfeits"; the spell of the Grand Old Man, exercised at close quarters, was irresistible. Nor did Morley feel he could refuse the offer—a flattering one, after only three years in Parliament—of a seat in the Cabinet in charge of the affairs of Ireland, for which he cared so much. As Irish Secretary, Morley played a useful if subordinate part in the drafting of the first Home Rule Bill, going constantly between the Prime Minister and the Irish parliamentary leaders; but the main policy was always Gladstone's own.

The House of Commons rejected home rule, and the Government fell. Morley was by now too much interested and involved in political life to want, or even to be able, to extricate himself from it; he was greatly in demand as a public speaker, and had moreover developed enthusiasms about particular points, Irish home rule above all, which made him want to get them settled in a particular way. He went to the 'Round Table Conference', the year after the split, which was intended to re-unite the divided radicals; what with enthusiasm, and what with intransigence—apart from a clear head, he had not many of the virtues of the 'good committee man'—he played a prominent part in helping to decide its failure. His friendship with Chamberlain gradually broke down; in compensation, there grew up a curiously warm relation with Gladstone. Acton once said that the secret of Gladstone's liking for Morley was that Morley, alone of his colleagues, really cared about political theory. At any rate, the high churchman and the atheist had aims and interests enough in common, outside the religious field, in the last few years of Gladstone's life; and the atheist even earned the compliment in Gladstone's diary for 1892, "J. Morley . . . is on the whole . . . about the best stay I have." The context is not clear from the only available text*; but it is clear that on Gladstone's side there was decided friendship, and on Morley's an adulation that occasionally, in the tone of his letters, seemed almost to touch the sycophantic. Morley was at Gladstone's elbow during the unhappy differences with Parnell in 1890, and in 1892 returned to the chief secretaryship for Ireland. In a longer spell of office, he administered Ireland with sense and honesty, avoiding as best he could the forms of coercion he had denounced so forcibly a decade earlier, and mediating usefully with the Irish parliamentary leaders as he helped Gladstone prepare and debate the second Home Rule Bill. But he was not the most satisfactory of colleagues, for he put the Government's continued existence in danger through his rash insistence on a trumpety demand, that some other post be found for the permanent head of the Irish Office, whom he disliked.

That he could thus endanger a Government marks the eminence he had now reached in politics. Gladstone's final resignation put Morley in an awkward predicament: pacific all his life, he had given the Prime Minister to understand that the two of them felt alike in opposition to

* *Morley Life of Gladstone* III. 499n.

the rise in the naval estimates that Gladstone resigned over rather than accept; and then, when it came to the sticking point, Morley remained in office. His excuses were two: "I stay, because if I were to resign on ships, you would have to resign [publicly] on ships too, and that would wreck the party. If I resign on ships, you cannot resign on eyes and ears. But that is what, exactly to save the party, you desired to do. [Secondly] Therefore, on Irish grounds I stay." He had two more reasons, equally compelling, for remaining in office. He had fallen out with Harcourt, whose hasty gibes—at once forgotten by their author—he cherished in resentful memory, and he could trust no Liberal Cabinet that contained Harcourt and did not contain himself as watchdog over him. Moreover, he believed he was at last in reach of the goal of his political ambitions, the foreign secretaryship. He was able, by a judiciously managed intrigue, to keep Harcourt from the post of Prime Minister, but at the cost of remaining at the Irish Office himself for the unhappy 15 months of Rosebery's administration. Nothing more could be done for Ireland for the time being, and the Liberal party seemed doomed to a long spell of eclipse. (Morley even lost his Newcastle seat in the elections of 1895, though he was returned for Montrose next year.) At the end of 1898, after a published correspondence with Harcourt in which both writers seemed to abjure their claims to leadership (though Morley was later understood to have meant to keep his own alive), Morley gave up politics for biography. Asquith's caustic comment on the exchange of letters—"What a pity it is when big causes and interests get into the hands of grown-up children who will not play in the same nursery"—had its justifications; though it should be added in Morley's defence that all the principles of international policy he had learned from writing his *Life of Cobden* were outraged by the attitudes of the British Government and public towards France during the Fashoda crisis, which was just dying away. For the next five years his lives of Cromwell and Gladstone combined with a throat affection to keep him in the background; though he delivered one of the most powerful speeches of what came to be known as the 'pro-Boer' group of Little Englander Liberals just before the South African war began. He took his stand on the simple ground that for a great power to force a war on a small one, for reasons partly of commercial and partly of imperial ambition, was wrong.

Thus he identified himself once more with the pure, Millian radical element in the Liberal party; but he excluded himself from any prospect of the foreign secretaryship he coveted, for when the next Liberal Government was formed at the end of 1905 Campbell-Bannerman held firm to the nineteenth century tradition that Little Englanders must be kept out of the Foreign Office. (Campbell-Bannerman and Morley did not much respect each other. Morley used to refer to his leader, in tones of irony, as "the worthy man", and behind his back Campbell-Banner-

man described him by the revealing nickname of "Priscilla".)

In the new Cabinet Morley found himself at the India Office—"banished to the Brahmaputra", he called it, but in fact he enjoyed himself. He took a delight that was hardly seemly in so sincere a radical in the appurtenances of a Secretary of State, and democrat though he had always been in the Palace of Westminster he imposed a rigid autocracy in his own Office. His imagination, at 67, was keen enough still for him to enter with vivacity into the problems of a distant country he had never seen, and he made an important innovation in Indian government—he introduced Indian members both into the Viceroy's Council and into his own in London. But his early training in political theory now intervened to keep him from going too far in practice. "Not one whit more than you," he wrote to Minto the Viceroy in 1906, "do I think it desirable or possible, or even conceivable, to adapt English political institutions to the nations who inhabit India." He was too much a follower of Burke, in fact, to admit so grave a breach with tradition as would be needed to apply to India the principles of home rule he still advocated for Ireland.

When Campbell-Bannerman retired in 1908 Morley asked Asquith for a peerage, throwing out in passing the opinion that seniority gave him a right to claim the Chancellorship of the Exchequer instead if he wanted*; and he passed, as Viscount Morley of Blackburn (his birth-place), into the chamber whose powers he had denounced a generation earlier. He was glad at first to be free of the burden of attendance in the Commons—he had not let it weigh too heavy upon him since he returned to office; and two years later, beginning to feel his age, he gave up the India Office for the more glorious and less onerous post of Lord President of the Council. But his successor's severe illness soon brought him back to the India Office for several months' hard work; and he found it ran against the grain of his character for him to retire from having his finger on the pulse of important events.

It is interesting to see where Morley was led, and where he was not led, by this interest in keeping in touch with great affairs. One might have expected Chamberlain's associate of the '70's, the part author of the 'unauthorized programme' of 1885, to maintain an interest in the main home problems of those days; to campaign against clerical influences in education and rich men's power over land, and to move forward from the fight against landlords into the fight against industrialists, for the benefit of the under-dogs of English society who had always been the radicals' especial care. But though the battle of capital against labour was joined, Morley did not engage in it as a radical might have been expected to do; he followed Mill in mistrusting State power as an instrument of radical reform; and Marxian socialism re-

* "I have often thought that diffidence gives more trouble in public life than conceit": his opinion, recorded in 1891, had evidently not changed.

mained outside his wide range of sympathetic studies. At the turn of the century the Labour Party was founded, and most of the old Liberal electorate and their children have now moved from the Liberal into the Labour camp.* Somehow, the Liberal party failed to retain the sympathy of the working classes in town and country who had supported Gladstone; the votes that returned a huge Liberal majority in the 1906 elections were cast against conservatism as much as they were cast for liberalism, and in the long run the Liberal party went down. While it would not be just to Morley to blame him for seeing no further than his friends into the invisible, it is fair to point out that he, the theoretician of radicalism and the biographer of the greatest liberal as well as the greatest radical in British history, cannot escape all responsibility for the failure of the party, in which he was one of the leaders, to retain its hold on its firmest base.

Once he was back in office, he became more and more fascinated by problems of power, and his interests lay for ten years overseas rather than at home. He enjoyed taking the chair at sub-committees of the Committee of Imperial Defence which dealt with the Middle East, and displayed some grasp of the strategic problems involved in holding the North-West Frontier and securing the Persian Gulf from attack. The forbidden fruit of the Foreign Office continued to tempt him; he made friends with Sir Edward Grey, and it was arranged that he should answer for foreign affairs in the Lords. Consequently, he saw the most important dispatches and private letters, and had unusual opportunities for being exceptionally well informed, in a field which—fascinating though it must always be to those who can command reliable information—did not attract the attention of more than a few score men in the London of the women's franchise movement at its most hectic, the London of the great strikes of 1911 and the passionate, successive controversies over Lloyd George's first budget, the powers of the Lords, and Irish home rule. For a moment, in August 1911, Morley held the centre of the parliamentary stage: it was he who informed the Lords, a few hours before they took their final decision on the Parliament Bill, that "every vote given against my motion will be a vote for a large and prompt creation of peers." He made what he called "this unimpassioned but awakening clencher" on a suggestion from Buckingham Palace; it had the effect he desired, and the most tense division of this century showed that the Bill passed by 17 votes.

When he first went to the India Office, Morley told a friend that he was warning all his subordinates that any of them who offered to resign would have his resignation instantly accepted; he was determined, he said, not to work with threats of resignations hanging over him. Yet he himself constantly used the threat. Asquith used to talk in jest of the drawer he kept filled with Morley's letters of resignation, and a

* Compare Roy Jenkins, *Mr. Balfour's Poodle*, 8-9 and 196-201.

somewhat hostile witness reported that he resigned 23 times between December 1905 and January 1910. The years went by, and Morley was persuaded time and time again to remain in the Government after all; his keen wits and sensitive pride were still about him, his tongue and his pen as ready as ever. The Anglo-Irish crisis and the general European crisis of July 1914, arriving simultaneously, found him still Lord President; but his capacity to endure had worn out. He resigned, for the last time, the day before Great Britain entered the Great War.

He had a good and a bad reason for doing so. The good one was, as he put it to Lloyd George, that: "Personally my days were dwindling, I was a notorious peace-man and little-Englander, etc."—with the rest of Europe at war, let alone the question of British participation, his age and prejudices would hinder rather than help in the Cabinet, "the greatest source of the moral authority of the Government" (in Asquith's phrase) though he might so far have been. The bad one, set out in unusual confusion in his *Memorandum on Resignation*, was that Grey was pursuing a false policy in rushing (as Morley saw it) with unnecessary haste to France's aid. Would it not be better, Morley argued, to intervene diplomatically, as Gladstone's Government had done over the Belgian and Black Sea questions in 1870? Such a view revealed that Morley, for all his assiduous attendances at the Committee of Imperial Defence, could handle an abstract better than a concrete problem in strategy. In 1870 Belgium had been left alone; in 1914 it was invaded. The obligation under the old guarantee was therefore not contingent, but actual; the question whether it was to become operative had already been decided by German invasion, and did not remain open for diplomatic discussion. Moreover, behind the obligation in law lay the obligation in self-interest, to which Morley was equally blind; if Germany conquered France, as she very probably would if France had to fight without British help, what ally would remain to protect Great Britain from being despoiled in her turn by Germany, in Germany's good time? Grey, with his strong simplicity, saw both these points, and held them in focus together; Morley saw neither, and had to go.

He hardly spoke in public again, though he lived for nine years more, writing an autobiography, re-sorting his meticulously ordered papers, lamenting to his friends the decline of the party and the vanishing of the Victorian middle class he had adorned. He died at Wimbledon, a disappointed old man, in 1923.

(The author teaches Politics at Keble College, Oxford, and is a University Lecturer in Politics.)

THE INWARD EYE—II

BY NORMAN NICHOLSON

IT is often said that seven-eighths, or some such figure of the population of the United Kingdom consists of urban dwellers. This, of course, is ridiculous. Most of our people are still half-rural in their thought and habit—whether in small or middle-sized towns, in outer suburbs, or in those combs of allotments and railway-sidings and waste ground that cleave the built-up plateaux of the cities. The provincial English are still an indigenous race. They have all the traditional local pride of the villager. They feel themselves dependent upon and rooted to the land beneath them—clay, gravel, coal, iron-ore, river or canal or sea-shore. They have a continual curiosity about their own district, about the shared background which binds them together as a community far more securely than creed or class or politics. Especially in summer, when one is repeatedly made aware that the air over, say, Birmingham was, an hour previously, the air over Wenlock Edge, nearly every man outside of London is a countryman.

But how can the B.B.C., so predominantly metropolitan in outlook, speak to this huge rural-provincial audience? On the whole its attitude is that of the townsman on holiday. Country Magazine, in particular, has a disgusting, whimsy-whamsy tone. The listener is given a car-window view; he is made to feel like the week-end resident overhearing the talk in the bar-parlour. The Third, too, approaches the country with the same self-consciousness. It has given us a number of broadcasts concerned with the sounds of the countryside which were admirable in their way, but which tended still more to put the listener in the place of outsider and observer.

Recently, however, several commendable attempts have been made to deal with the country from the inside, from the point of view of the people who live there. The most ambitious was the series called *Landscape and Life*, in which a group of speakers discussed various landscapes in terms of geology, botany, ornithology and so on, linking these together to provide a simplified ecological survey. The success of each programme depended on the quality of the broadcasters (who differed each week) but the effect of the whole was undoubtedly stimulating. One felt a sense of the interdependence of man and his environment, of history and physical geography. It mattered very little whether or not the scenes were familiar—for my own part I found the talk on the

meadows and marshes of the Stour every bit as fascinating as that on Windermere (for some odd reason tautologically referred to as "Lake Windermere"). Indeed, this was in no way a regional programme. It dealt with subjects of enormous importance to all of us; it helped us, wherever we live, to understand our own surroundings, to adjust ourselves to our environment.

A more specialized and even more satisfying venture was the set of talks given on the Third by W. G. Hoskin on the history of man's modifications of the natural scene. Mr. Hoskin is a most able broadcaster and whether or not he spoke from a script he achieved an unusual effect of spontaneity. His talks dealt with such things as the pattern of medieval agriculture, the results of enclosure, the "embellishment" of the eighteenth century, the coming of railways and canals. I could only have wished that he had dealt also with the great rural-industrial landscape of so much of the North and the Midlands. Here was a programme which came close to every one. Looking out of my window as I listened, I saw even the stone walls take on a new meaning—a somewhat similar series, a year or so ago, on the landscape of towns, was almost equally revealing.

Archeology is a more difficult subject to treat since it is almost invariably requires consideration of one particular place. Nevertheless, in May we were given a good feature programme about Avebury—though, as in so many programmes of its type, it sounded at times like a good talk forced into the wrong shape. In the study of specific sites the Regions are no doubt in a better position than the national Home Service, but the thing to remember is that this is not so much the fad of a few country parsons, as the almost passionate concern of many thousands of people throughout the country. I am not suggesting that we are a nation of archeologists, but that everywhere, in the provinces at least, there is an intuitive curiosity about the roots that join a generation to its locality and to its past—even if it takes no more serious form than gossip about the cricket team of 20 years ago or an old man's mumbling memories of how the ragwort grew where now the garage stands. This pre-occupation with the invisible sinews of society is one of the least-changing aspects of English life, yet is it scarcely understood, scarcely perceived perhaps, in the metropolis. In this respect, the independent local weekly is more "national" than *The Times* and the town-crier than the B.B.C.

(Mr. Nicholson writes from Cumberland. His third article on radio listening will be published in the September number of THE FORT-NIGHTLY.)

THE ARCHAEOLOGISTS

When we are buried under the weight of our future,
Beneath the soft oblivion of time,
As the accomplished Etruscans, or the smooth
Cretans, whose heavy eyes despise us still,
Who will, from shards and shreds of rag and bone
Judge us, touch with timid and reverent fingers
The humble, abandoned things made smooth by use,
Discarded, unregarded; smashed cup, forgotten
Spoons, and the fragments of a broken mirror
Once misted by living breath? Will eyes as cool
As ours which stare indifferently on the pitiful
Relics of love and the ruins of warmth and home,
Judge and condemn? Or, linking hand to hand,
Will find the ephemeral link of living flesh
Rekindle the spark, revive from these mute shards
The shadow of what we were, then pitying
See in our dust their ultimate desolation.

WEATHERCOCK

Mauled by the winds and fingered by the breezes'
Touch, I tack and veer, yet never resting.
Now clean copper in the brittle sunlight,
Then smeared by the shadows of the grey clouds drifting.
Look upward and see. I warn the doubting heart.
No rest, no peace for those who follow the winds'
Listless or loud call. Only the lark
Who leaps to the heart of the sun finds its true rest,
And he alone who gives back all, sets free
His life; as he who heard in the tolling cry
Of the cock, man's failure and God's certainty,
Knows that only the broken heart is whole.

MARGARET STANLEY-WRENCH

FRENCH FARMERS IN COURT

BY LEN ORTZEN

IN the broad valley of the Dives the apple trees were beginning to be burdened with their red-and-yellow fruits, and stolid-looking cows were munching placidly at the thick, luscious grass. I overtook a man with muddy boots and a ragged cap who was pressing on the creaking pedals of a rusty bicycle and muttering fiercely to himself. Round the bend, two black-clad women ahead were hurrying to the market, each carrying a wide, shallow basket filled with packages of butter; then the lane rose steeply to meet the main road from Caen to Rouen.

Here on the hilltop, where the countryside begins to change in aspect as it slopes gently down to the wheat-growing plain, is the *chef-lieu du canton*. The little town straggles along the main road for several hundred yards, reducing its width and curbing its purposeful mission. Two or three high-wheeled, covered carts were slowly advancing up the hill, and a tradesman's van was turning into the market place behind the *mairie*. Most of the stalls were already erected, and a thin crowd of shoppers was circulating to investigate prices and quality, much as other crowds have done here on Saturday mornings for centuries past.

As this was the first Saturday in the month, a minor activity was also noticeable around the doorway of the one-storey *mairie*. There were four cars parked in front of the building; and several bicycles, to which I added my own, were leaning against the wall on either side of the open doorway. A few men, in ones and twos, were going in with brisk tread and a business-like manner, most of them well-dressed in a city, though provincial, style. Two or three others, wearing nondescript, shapeless old clothes, hesitated first on the pavement, looking up at the first-floor windows, before stepping slowly, almost cautiously, into the dim entrance-hall of the *mairie*. One like these was the man with a ragged cap whom I had passed in the lane, and who now propped his ancient bicycle against mine. He stood and studied the poster advertising an American film for the one weekly show at the local cinema. Then his eye was attracted to the small notice-board fixed to the wall. Behind the flimsy wire cover were two yellowing papers, one headed *Monte Publique* and giving the regulations governing fees for stud bulls, the other calling attention to an outdated change in the weekly collection of refuse. He examined both these at length, as though they dealt with

matters of great importance to him and for which alone he had cycled many miles this morning. When he looked away, rather regretfully, it was to gaze at the Café de la Paix on the other side of the roadway; and he licked his lips and the fringe of his clipped moustache.

"It's up there—*le tribunal paritaire*?" he said to me, more statement than question, making a little upward nod as his eyes slowly slid in my direction. "The court? Yes, I think so. I'm going to see Maître Guizot." "*C'est le tribunal paritaire*," he muttered, half to himself, and plunged into the doorway as though fearful of taking root on the pavement.

We arrived together at the top of the flight of stone steps. From behind the tall, closed door bearing the small inscription '*Étude de Maître Guizot. Greffier*' was coming a loud hum of voices. I pushed open the heavy, creaking door. A score or so of people were in the large room, some sitting on chairs and benches that were arranged in three rows, others standing about in small groups and chatting. One of the two long windows was open and the early morning sun was striking full into the room. In one corner, between two tables overladen with files and documents, was a stove with a galvanized pipe that rose almost to the ceiling before its end disappeared through a hole in the wall. High along the far, austere wall, brightened by the sunlight, were the painted words *La Loi et la Paix*. There was a raised platform at that end of the room, separated from the greater half by a waist-high wooden barrier; and on the platform was a long table with several chairs behind it, all empty.

A general movement increased the noise in the room for a few minutes, but it was a movement to take up positions. Now behind the long table were seated the five men who compose the tribunal for assessing and judging agricultural disputes in the *canton*. Four of them were farmers, two elected by the tenant farmers of the *canton* and two by the landowners. Among them I now recognized old M. Roget, who sells butter and eggs to my wife every week; dressed as he now was, and freshly shaven, it was not easy to connect him with the grubby, ill-clad man who stands with his wife behind their stall. The centre of the five, still wearing his overcoat, was the *juge de paix* for the *canton*. Ruddy-faced Maître Guizot, in his function of clerk to the court, had drawn up a chair to one end of the table and was glancing through some papers. The sounds of carts rumbling over the cobbles, an impatiently repeated hooter or two, and the cries of the market becoming busy rose from the street below and drifted into the courtroom.

The thin, keen-eyed magistrate unbuttoned his overcoat—a gesture which seemed symbolic of the raising of a curtain—and the first case began. A tenant farmer was being sued by his landlord for not having left the boundaries of the farm in good condition at the end of his ten-

ancy. A small man in a blue whipcord jacket, who had been leaning against the wooden barrier with one arm spread familiarly along it, came down to collect the tenant, a peasant who had not shaved for several days and who carried the smells of a primitive stable to the platform. The fences and hedges, maintained the man in the blue jacket, who was presumably a barrister, were in as good condition at the end of the tenancy as at the beginning; though, he added with a derogatory look at the landlord, this was little in favour of their condition then. The landlord was conducting his own case. He stood in front of the table, next to the little barrister, and read his own statement, to which he had sworn before the *juge de paix* of the *canton* where he lived, that a verbal agreement on hedge-repairing existed between him and his ex-tenant.

The old lease was produced and examined; a copy of the official *Statut du Fermage* was fetched by Maître Guizot. They were passed from hand to hand, but none of the five men behind the table retained them for more than a few seconds. A few of the people sitting in the rows of chairs began to talk among themselves, to light cigarettes, and the man with the muddy boots unwrapped a packet of cheese sandwiches and started to eat them noisily.

The members of the tribunal withdrew through a door at the back of the platform, but this was a mere formality; in less than a minute they were back in their places. "*Renvoyée en conciliation*," announced the *juge de paix*, as though to say 'let them fight it out among themselves.' At a future date he, alone, would call the two parties before him and try to get them to come to a mutual agreement.

Maître Guizot, puffing at a Gauloise, walked down to his table to collect some documents, and opened the second of the long windows. The unmistakable, piercing hooter of one of the few daily buses eliminated all other sounds for many seconds. The little barrister came and collected a surly-looking farmer wearing spectacles and with an old, belted overcoat draped loosely around him. The man next to me swallowed the last portion of his cheese sandwiches, crumpled the paper and dropped it on the floor but carefully put the paper-bag into a pocket, and advanced to the platform. He touched his ragged cap to the tribunal but kept it on.

"You're the plaintiff—the tenant?" said the magistrate, looking up from his papers with a keen glance. "You want your landlord to remove some trees from a field?" "*Voilà*. The Electricity Board cut down the trees three years ago," he began in a flat voice as though repeating a lesson learnt over-much. "They're still there, and half the field can't be cultivated. I want the landlord to take them away and I ask for twenty-five thousand francs damages. I've asked him many times but he's done nothing." "Once, you asked," snapped the little barrister. "In a letter dated less than two months ago." "I asked him

many times, man to man," said the tenant in a different voice, and with a curt nod towards his landlord. "He's done nothing, and that's why I've had to come here. What's the use of *writing* to him? He never replies."

"I never reply!" The surly farmer stepped forward. "And how many times have you ever written to me?" The tenant spread his hands and hunched his shoulders. "But since you never reply . . ." He turned to the appreciative tribunal. "Every time I've met him I've asked him to have these trees taken away." "All I know about is this one letter," said the man in the blue jacket, as though he thought it time for him to put in a word. "Only the documents on file can be accepted in justification."

The tribunal moved restlessly and looked with disapproval at the barrister and his client. It was quite true that this was a court of law, but even so . . . and since the landlord did not deny the verbal requests having been made . . . "Why didn't you remove the trees yourself?" old M. Roget asked the tenant. "You could have dragged them into a ditch or somewhere, with your horses." "Ah yes—and be accused of theft! You don't know *him*. I've had some!"

The little barrister appeared to sense that the sympathy of the tribunal was being drawn by the tenant. "What we can do," he offered, leaning negligently against the table, "is to make a present of the trees to the tenant. And we'll say no more about the matter." The members of the tribunal stirred on their chairs and lent forward. It was getting near the time for aperitifs. "Do you give the trees to the plaintiff?" asked the magistrate, looking at the landlord. A sudden sharp silence filled the room for a few seconds, until broken into by the barrister. "Well, say something," he cried impatiently. "Yes or no." The landlord gulped. "Yes." The tenant shuffled his muddy boots. "But I don't want the trees. I want them removed by the landlord."

Maître Guizot slumped back in his chair and gazed pensively at the clear sky beyond the windows. The smoke from half-a-dozen Gauloises was curling about above the clustered people, drifting up to the thick black letters of *La Loi et la Paix*. "But the trees must be worth something," someone remarked to the tenant. "They're wet. They're soaked. I want them removed." "What wood isn't wet," exclaimed the *juge de paix*. "You should see some of the stuff that's sold to me, for my stove at home." "Three years ago the trees wouldn't have been soaked."

"I think the point is," quietly said M. Roget, "that the field is difficult to reach with a waggon. I'm a neighbour of the plaintiff, and I know it's almost impossible to find any wood-merchant to come and collect tree-trunks. I think that's the crux of the matter." The men behind the table looked at each other, and the magistrate gestured to the three standing on the platform. "Will you just go out on the landing

"while we deliberate?" he said. As soon as they had left the room the five men began to nod and smile and to mutter to each other. Then the magistrate dictated the decision to Maître Guizot, who wrote it down with great speed. "... ordain that the said trees be removed by the defendant or his agents . . ." "Before the end of the month?" quickly suggested M. Roget from the end of the table. "... before the end of the month . . . all costs of this case to be borne by the defendant . . . no damages allowed to the plaintiff. There. Call them in, and read out the verdict, and we can all go and have a drink." He buttoned his overcoat and made a move to leave the table, since no one went to call the three from the landing. As I was nearest to the door I got up and opened it. The man with the muddy boots, still wearing his cap, led the others to the platform. They all listened impassively to Maître Guizot, while the members of the *tribunal paritaire* sat back and lit cigarettes, like spectators preparing for the interval.

We all tramped down the stone steps and across the bare hall of the *mairie*. Outside, many housewives were hurrying homewards with bulging shopping-bags. The clock above the *mairie* struck eleven cracked notes as the tribunal, Maître Guizot, some barristers, the man in the ragged cap, separately and in small groups, crossed the roadway to enter the Café de la Paix. It was just time for aperitifs.

CORRESPONDENCE

INDIA'S FOREIGN POLICY

To the Editor of THE FORTNIGHTLY.

Sir,

In his interesting article on India's Foreign Policy in the July FORTNIGHTLY your correspondent's statement that "Chinese Communism is as much Chinese as it is Communist" can hardly go unchallenged. No doubt by now your correspondent will have studied the new Chinese Constitution adopted in June, by which all power, reaching through China, is concentrated in a small State Council of apparently not more than a hundred people; while the Chairman of the Republic (with only one Vice-Chairman now instead of six as in the Common Programme) has absolute command over all the armed forces. Even the promised autonomy to be exercised by the Local People's Congresses at different levels, which are in process of being elected, is negatived in the Constitution by the creation of small Councils at each level to act as "administrative organs of the State," with the duty of suspending, revising or annulling any action of the Local Congresses deemed objectionable.

The policy initiated this year by the Communists of gradually collectivizing all the land and converting all industry and commerce to State ownership is too generally known by now to need description. Such iron and far-reaching a monopoly of power by a tiny minority can only be described as utterly un-Chinese. Even in the short reign of Shih Huang Ti 2000 years ago, China's only previous experience of totalitarian rule, there was nothing like it. True, the Emperors and under them the Viceroyes were autocratic, but in the best days of every dynasty they were remarkably careful to keep in with public opinion, and the people were noticeably free from bureaucratic interference, and largely governed themselves through their village elders and mercantile guilds.

May I as courteously as I can raise one more objection? Your contributor says: "It is incredible that China could ever, like the apostate Japan of the 'forties, wish to impose herself on her Asian neighbours." But this is exactly what she always has done when she could. Both Mings and Manchus, while they were strong, were great conquerors. Burma and Annam once paid tribute to China; Korea for many years acknowledged her as suzerain. And it looks as if the Communists were following in the same path. Their unprovoked and unjustifiable invasion of harmless Tibet is one example. This year (as U Nu complained to Chou En-lai at their recent meeting) they have invited some two hundred Burmese Communists to China for training—for what reason but to build up a Communist fifth column in Burma? And the terrific "peace campaign" in Asian countries, organized and carried out by Peking in the autumn of 1952 with every possible device of propaganda to create sympathy for China and hatred of the white races, points in the same direction.

In conclusion, it may be mentioned that both Burmese and Ceylon papers, also one or two in Indonesia, have recently begun to show considerable fear of Chinese Communist "imperialism".

Yours faithfully,
O. M. GREEN.

Virginia Water.

THE FORTNIGHTLY LIBRARY

VANBRUGH AND HAWKSMOOR

By F. W. WENTWORTH-SHEILDS

In the history of architecture, England has a secure and deserved place. The assertion needs no argument provided it is not taken to mean that England is characterized by good architecture. The contrary is obvious. To make matters worse, we have an unrepentant habit of indifference to our few great architects and their works, or rather, an invariable practice of allowing material expediency to override aesthetic considerations. As a result, many of our finest buildings are either engulfed or obscured by a prevailing setting of mediocre hotch-potch.

In 1710, an act of Parliament provided for the building of 50 new churches in the City of London and a Commission was appointed to control their erection. Amongst other considerations, humbly offered to the Commissioners by Sir John Vanbrugh, was a set of eight rules which he deemed it would be necessary to observe. The second of these laid down: "That they [the churches] may be so plac'd, to be fairly View'd at such proper distances, as is necessary to show their Exterior Form, to the best Advantage, as at the ends of Large and Strait Streets, or on the Side of Squares and Other open Places." Laurence Whistler* quotes all of "Mr. Van-Brugg's Proposals about Building ye new Churches" and qualifies them with the penetrating remark that: "The worldly ought always to confine their conversation to the world. When they pay lip-service to other values, as Vanbrugh does in these proposals, a dreadful weariness emanates from their words..." Vanbrugh's final paragraph, with its savour of humbug, justifies Mr. Whistler's comment. "Upon the whole it may be worth considering, that since Christianity began, there is but one Instance where the Inhabitants

of a City have had so Glorious an Occasion as this, to Adorn both their Religion and their Towne at once. A Resolution taken, and money provided to raise fifty New Churches in so short a time shews so glowing a Zeal, and so Noble a Generosity, that t'were pittty Posterity shou'd not have an equal opinion of the Politeness of the Age, by finding the edifices suitable to what produc'd them."

The sentiments may be lavishly garnished but they prompt, nevertheless, an uneasy reflection that, in the present day and age, such a project would seem to be unimaginably extravagant. However, there is little reason to doubt that Vanbrugh thought of it quite sincerely as a glorious occasion. He had no private ends to serve. For, as Mr. Whistler writes: "Vanbrugh, himself, had stood no chance with the Commission. If the naughty worldliness of his plays was not enough to rule him out as a church-designer, then his Whiggish antipathy to the 'High Church blockheads' presumably was. That was so inevitable as not to be even vexatious to him, perhaps." But where now is the remaining evidence of such glowing zeal and noble generosity? Of the 50 churches authorized to be built, only ten were completed and six of them came from the inspired hand of Nicholas Hawksmoor.

A survey of the Hawksmoor churches is a disquieting measure of the architectural manners of later ages. As an example, St. George's, Bloomsbury, is perhaps the most familiar, by name at least, for close acquaintanceship with the whole shape of the building is practically impossible. Wedged tightly and unhappily between its neighbours, with an unsightly, prefabricated tea-bar in the churchyard, the narrow confines

* *The Imagination of Vanbrugh and his Fellow Artists*, by Laurence Whistler. Batsford. 73s. 6d.

of its site are like a contemptuous rejection of Vanbrugh's proposed rule that the city churches should be so placed as to show their exterior forms to the best advantage. The environment of Christ Church, Spitalfields, is little better; though this curiously beautiful edifice has a scale and majesty that dominates even the clamour and bustle of the contiguous markets. As a final instance, the unpardonably insolent liberties that have been taken with the structure and surroundings of St. Mary Woolnoth offer a bitter reproach to the posterity envisaged by Vanbrugh. The treatment suffered by this small, unique church has had the almost profane result of marking the site as a mere means of access to an underground station.

Nicholas Hawksmoor is manifestly an example of our neglect. The importance and the original quality of his architecture has been more than half-forgotten or, at any rate, elbowed out of sight by the more insistent and spectacular personality of Sir John Vanbrugh, his contemporary and collaborator. Mr. Whistler's work, as its title suggests, deals mainly with the nature of Vanbrugh's talent, but a fascinating secondary theme spreads through the pages—a persuasive reappraisal of Hawksmoor. Indeed, the revised estimate of Hawksmoor's stature is of such engrossing interest that the reader may well find himself wondering whether the book was compiled in order to present this one important deduction. But the speculation is unfair to the author. The work is an exhaustive and beautifully written examination of Vanbrugh's art; but it does not, as he says, "pretend to be a full description of his work." His research has enabled him to include in the text a number of Vanbrugh letters and papers which have not been published before; and, among the many excellent illustrations, there are some recently discovered drawings which define, with intriguing clarity, the considerable extent to which Vanbrugh must have depended on Hawksmoor's draughtsmanship and invention.

The architectural renown of Van-

brugh needs no buttressing. It is substantial, and enduring, and it is further reinforced by his versatile accomplishments in other fields—as a soldier and a playwright. As Mr. Whistler puts it: "His overgrown reputation can be clipped and still remain very handsome." The redistribution of credits is thus satisfactorily equitable. Furthermore, it is likely that an understanding awareness of the complementary parts that were fused to create the whole magnificence of such places as Castle Howard, Blenheim and Kimbolton tends to quicken our interest and, even, to heighten our admiration. "There was nothing so important in the lives of the two men" Mr. Whistler writes, "as their agreement to combine."

CARNOT, by S. J. Watson. *The Bodley Head*. 18s.

NAPOLÉON AND THE AWAKENING OF EUROPE, by F. M. H. Markham. *English Universities Press*. 7s. 6d.

Next to Napoleon, Lazare Carnot was probably the greatest military genius which revolutionary France produced. In the magic years 1795-1797 when their talents were perfectly combined, with Carnot as the 'Organizer of Victory' for the Directory and young Bonaparte as the victorious general in Italy, their attainments were, in Mr. Watson's words, "essentially complementary". Already in 1793 at Wattignies Carnot had shown his remarkable talents in the field, and by his handling of the *levée en masse* he had revolutionized the administration of modern war. In the Committee of Public Safety, as later in the Directory, he personified the initiative and resolve of French arms. He believed in the Republic and in the ideals it proclaimed. His flair for recognizing genius in others was shown by his appointment of Bonaparte to his first independent command. If Bonaparte ill repaid this service by allowing him to go into exile until 1800, he returned the compliment by entrusting this unrepentant republican with the post of Minister of War under the Consulate; and Carnot

accepted it, for he was a patriot as well as a republican. For this reason he did not hesitate to resist the conversion of the Consulate into the Empire and to oppose all Napoleon's subsequent ambitions, just as he did not hesitate to accept the post of Minister of the Interior during the 'Hundred Days', in preference to a restored Bourbon monarchy.

Carnot held a remarkable series of high offices between 1792 and 1815, including the presidency of the Convention and of the Directory. Yet he was utterly different from the other leading figures, like Fouché and Talleyrand, who likewise tended to come to the top in the political crises of these years. They survived through supple opportunism; Carnot recurred because he evoked a trust which was inspired by his personal integrity as well as by his renowned efficiency in administration. His power and his influence lay in good repute, theirs in skilful political manoeuvre. In terms of personal integrity and devotion to principle he is a much finer character than Napoleon himself. Mr. Watson, who like Carnot is also a regular officer in the Engineers, has written the first comprehensive biography of Carnot in English. Although it cannot rival the definitive study published in French a few years ago by Marcel Reinhard, it is a thoroughly workmanlike and sensible book, and should serve the useful purpose of making one of the admirable characters of the Revolution more familiar to English readers. It appropriately devotes considerable space to Carnot's military achievements and principles, but contrives also to leave us with a sympathetic and fair picture of the man.

Although Napoleon inevitably figures very large in Mr. Watson's account of the career of Carnot, Carnot hardly appears at all in Mr. Markham's highly compressed and factual account of the career of Napoleon. To undertake yet another short and popularly written study of Napoleon is to invite a host of invidious comparisons. The present little book attempts to achieve difference partly by its emphasis (in accordance with the general theme of Mr. A. L.

Rowse's 'Teach Yourself History' series) upon the second half of its title, and partly by some reassessment of the significance of Napoleon in history. The purely narrative sections of the book frequently presuppose a higher degree of knowledge of the history of the French Revolution and of the European background than the readers for whom it is intended are likely to have; and the casual references to Carnot are but an example of this. Can anyone who needs to be told all this about Napoleon be expected to know so much about the era?

Yet Mr. Markham's stimulating little study has something to offer the more widely-read student of Napoleonic history. He holds that Napoleon was really the "last of the enlightened despots" rather than the first of the modern dictators; that he failed, in consequence, to understand the spirit of nationality which his conduct aroused in Italy and Germany; but that he was in the end defeated not by this spirit, which was still too feeble to be decisive, but "by his own overreaching ambition and by the dynastic rulers who, after repeated and bitter lessons, learned how to combine and to modernize their military effort." It is on the "awakening of Europe", rather than on "Napoleon", that the author has most of value and interest to offer.

DAVID THOMSON

THE PAINTED MEN, by T. C. Lethbridge, *Andrew Melrose*. 15s.

The "painted men" are the Picts of history, who appear with the Scots as the historic invaders of the Roman peace in southern Britain. The author is in revolt against this conventional view. Indeed those who know his work would hardly expect him to be conventional. He is none the less entertaining. The *Picti*, or painted men so named by the Roman soldiery, were in fact (he suggests) tattooed; and as for being naked warriors they doubtless threw off their plaids when they rushed into battle, as the Highlanders of later ages did. But they were never called

picti by their Celtic contemporaries. To these they were the same as the *Cruithni*, who came from the north across the sea and conquered the whole land.

So far we may follow without much hesitation. Nobody would claim now that William the Conqueror's followers were all Normans, or all the Anglo-Saxons (if any) Angles or Saxons. Tribal hordes acquire a common name, however heterogeneous their origins. The *Picti* are unlikely to have called themselves by that name. Whoever they were they acted together; and wherever they came from they came from overseas. The author claims them however to have been Caesar's allies under the name of Pictones on the coast of the Bay of Biscay. There they were the neighbours of the Veneti, the seafaring tribe who long defied him—enlisting our interest as the earliest known defenders of the Channel. The Pictones and the Santoni supplied the Romans with ships and the Veneti went down before them in a naval battle.

The Pictones are here assumed (it is an unconfirmed assumption) to have settled on the shores of western Britain and round the north of Scotland as far as the Orkneys. Continuous immigration from the opposite coasts of Brittany and the Bay of Biscay is vouched for by ample evidence; the west-of-Scotland route insisted on by the author represents a new theory. Readers must seek its justification in the text and maps.

The second theme of the book is the origin of the *brochs* and other primitive constructions combining the functions of dwelling-house and fortress. They are found in the Hebrides, the extreme north of Scotland, the Orkneys and Shetlands, and some are isolated in Galloway. The *brochs* are the remains of towers, shaped like a thimble, built of dry stones. Many of these are standing; they appear formidable enough for early warfare, they would not stand a Roman siege-train or the assault of disciplined troops. The other type, called by the author "wheel-houses", are the remains of somewhat similar structures uncovered by excava-

tion. Both have staircases in the interior of the walls. Some of these excavations have been conducted by the author himself and his descriptions and plans are a contribution to the archaeology of which he makes game elsewhere. But in sailing into creeks and harbours little visited by the learned, he has voyaged into fascinating lands of the imaginary or the speculative. His fellow Fellows of the Society of Antiquaries cannot follow or contradict him there. As to the origin of the Picts, the possible provenance of the Stone of Scone or Scon or Scoon from Ireland and the jolly notion that we have all got something Pictish in us—all this and much besides is highly controversial. Doubtless that is what it is meant to be.

W. THOMSON HILL

SIR WILLIAM PETTY, Portrait of a Genius, by E. Strauss. *The Bodley Head. 25s.*

"Genius" is notoriously dangerous for ordinary mortals to assess and still more so to catalogue. In setting forth the genius of Sir William Petty, the author has wisely avoided a merely chronological treatment of his career. Instead, he has aimed at drawing a portrait showing various facets of his subject—The Man of Property, The Man of Parts, the Man of Principle, The Writer, and so on. As a result there emerges the figure of a man of great originality, forceful character, and considerable achievement which is enhanced rather than diminished by equally human foibles and limitations.

Beginning without any of the advantages of noble or even of wealthy birth—his father was a poor clothier in Romsey where William was born in 1623—Petty won distinction for himself in various fields. His unusual qualities showed themselves early. At 14 he went to sea as a cabin-boy. Then, scraping together what money he could by small trading, he induced the Jesuit College at Caen to admit him to its school. There he learned something of languages and mathematics. Then he

spent two years in studying medicine at Utrecht, Leyden, Amsterdam, and Paris. Finally in March 1650 he became a doctor in Physic at Oxford, and at 27 was appointed Professor of Anatomy there.

Two years later he was in Ireland as Apothecary-General to the Commonwealth Army of Occupation. Thus he was on hand when the problem arose of distributing forfeited Irish estates among Commonwealth soldiers. A thorough survey of the land was necessary. Upon this project Petty concentrated all his mind and energy, undertaking so to organize the work of surveying and distribution that within twelve months it should be completed. Hence the great Down Survey, the accomplishment of which was a triumph of administrative genius. We need not be surprised that Petty found means to win favour with the restored Stuarts and hence became one of the original charter-members of Charles II's Royal Society in 1662.

Perhaps Petty's chief characteristic was his unquenchable passion for the quantitative measure of social facts of all kinds. The results, owing to the lack of exact data and methods, were often of doubtful value in themselves. But the pioneering nature of his work was of the highest consequence. His was the first serious attempt to calculate national income and its constituents. After the Great Fire of London he produced a plan not only for rebuilding the City but also for its government on lines which anticipated closely those of the modern L.C.C. He advocated a system of educational scholarships, and a state medical service of salaried doctors. Perhaps most striking of all was his inspired guess at the existence of germs as the explanation of plague-epidemics.

A man of his calibre is entitled to be regarded as a genius; and the author has placed his readers in his debt by presenting Petty's portrait in this balanced and readable fashion.

S. REED BRETT

END OF AN EXILE, by James Pakes. *Valentine, Mitchell*. 15s.

THE CHURCH AND THE JEWISH PEOPLE. Edited by Göte. 10s. 6d.

Hedenquist. *Edinburgh House Press*.

THE ONE REMAINS, by Stewart Perowne. *Hodder and Stoughton*. 20s.

These three books between them afford an invaluable conspectus of the problem of the Jew as reflected in the establishment of the State of Israel. The great value of Dr. Parkes's book is that it makes us realize, as few books on the subject have done, that Israel is as much a problem to the Jew as it is to the Gentile world in which it has to live, and in which its foothold is as yet but precarious.

The majority of the Jews who now live in the State of Israel are by no means homogeneous; they have been gathered from the Diaspora out of nations which run all the way from the West and its democratic culture to the ghettos of Russia and the more backward races of N. Africa and the East. More, they differ in ideology, and Israel is as much a melting-pot of ideas as of nations. The Orthodox wish to re-establish on the soil of the country a theocracy which conforms as largely as possible to ancient Jewish law and religion, and between them and the Zionists, and between both and the groups which are fundamentally secularist and of all shades of socialist thought, there is an acute tension which as yet shows no sign of being resolved. The essence of the situation therefore is that a State in spiritual turmoil, to state the case in minimum terms, faces a world in like turmoil—who then can prophesy the future of Israel? Will it become a completely secularist State bound together only by the ties of race, or will it recover some kind of religious faith which will create a State *sui generis* in the modern world?

Dr. Parkes is himself convinced that some such faith is part and parcel of the heritage and make-up of the Jew.

but he is clear that the great majority of Jews will never find their home in Israel. They will remain scattered among the nations of the Gentiles, and to the end of foreseeable time, the Diaspora will remain as a vitally important fact for Israel. It will be important, not merely because its material support for Israel will be needed for a long time yet, but even more for the fact that it will mediate to Israel its own first-hand contact with the Gentile world, and that the faith of Israel will spring from the interplay of the experience of the Diaspora with the ancient faith of Israel. On the other hand the mere fact that there is now a national centre of Judaism will serve as a perpetual reminder to the Diaspora of the central faith of Judaism and will serve as a barrier to the complete assimilation of the Jew in the particular nation in which he lives.

Such a bare summary does but scant justice to the immense wealth of knowledge and history which Dr. Parkes has brought to the making of this book; its great achievement is that it helps us, as few books do, to see the situation, as it appears to the Jew in Israel, and that is surely the beginning of understanding. It is an absorbing book about one of the crucial themes of modern existence.

At this stage it is appropriate that attention be called to the two remaining volumes. In *The Church and the Jewish People* Dr. Göte Hedenquist heads a team of writers drawn both from non-Roman Churches and from Jews. It represents the attitude of the World Council of Churches and one could wish that its tone and temper could speedily be reflected in the rank and file of the Churches. It is a plea for the recognition of the fact that the Jew as well as the Christian inherits the ancient promises of God, and therefore it seeks to suggest the fields within which co-operation ought to be possible, to define the temper in which the Christian should approach the Jew, especially in discussions concerning religion itself. Penitence for past wrongs, a new appreciation of the place of the Jew in the Bible and, above all, the experience of

suffering in the modern world have been the main realities which have prompted it, and it is far and away the best book we have on a theme which is hedged about with all manner of prejudice on both sides.

Mr. Perowne's book comes from a distinguished servant of the Middle East who has known and loved Jerusalem for many years, and in it he records some of his own reflections on the city as it is to-day. He writes as one whose contacts are mostly with the Arab section of the city and he has therefore vivid cameos to give us of the Arab refugee problem and the steps that are being taken to solve it, but the curious fact is that the Jews of Jerusalem themselves hardly ever appear on the scene. It cannot therefore be called a picture of the whole of Jerusalem, but his sketches of the history of the city are really evocative of its recurrent tragedy and to that extent provide a lively background to the scene as he sees it to-day.

B. C. PLOWRIGHT

JOSHUA WATSON 1771-1855,
by A. B. Webster. *S.P.C.K.* 15s.

Most people interested in the nineteenth-century know the Chapham sect; far less has been written about the Hackney Phalanx (or Clapton sect), which was its High Church equivalent. It is fitting that this life of Joshua Watson, as one of its responsible leaders, should appear to mark the centenary of his death next year. Mr. Webster has made a real contribution in rescuing the memory of a body of men, closely united in theological and political outlook, who influenced the life of the country in a quiet but effective manner in the first half of the century. Watson, who retired from business at the age of 43 to devote his life to pious and charitable works, may best be thought of as one whose life was given to the consecration by the Church of life in England; he made "one of the most solid and valuable contributions ever made by a layman to the Church of England."

Watson had a singular talent for busi-

ness, as the affectionate name 'Arch Treasurer' reveals, and he and his friends were particularly well placed by their intimacy with so many of the influential people of the day (the Archbishop, the Prime Minister and the Poet Laureate among them), to ensure the success of their many and varied projects. Wordsworth once said that Watson had created a fourth order in the Church and that the Litany should be amended to read "that it may please thee to illuminate all Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, and also Joshua Watson . . ."

The narrative of his achievements, delightfully presented by Mr. Webster, is impressive. He was secretary of a relief fund for German sufferers from the Napoleonic wars; he was largely responsible for the foundation of the Church Building Society, and the statistics here given showing the efforts of the churches to keep pace with the growing population are of great interest. As treasurer of S.P.C.K. he greatly expanded its work and its income; as first treasurer of the National Society, formed in 1811 at his house for the education of the poor, he was largely responsible not only for pioneering popular elementary education but for ensuring that it should be Christian and not secular. His attendance at the meetings of these societies and of S.P.G. was assiduous: his advice and counsel were of such value that it was once said to him: "If you think we can do without you, you are the only person of that opinion." He took a deep interest in the colonial church, and had many friends among its bishops; and he played a leading part in the foundation of King's College, London, and of the Ecclesiastical Commission.

Watson was a link between the High Churchmen before and after the Oxford Movement. He was intimate with Hugh James Rose, and knew both Pusey and Newman, who dedicated to him, though an "unsanctioned offering", a volume of his *Parochial Sermons*. But Watson deplored Newman's later development, and indeed disagreed with much of the

Oxford Movement, while admiring its good results. As the author suggests, a 'Westminster Movement' led by the Hackney Phalanx and rejuvenated from Oxford and Cambridge might have had as much concern for the conservation of the State as for the rights of the Church.

Mr. Webster has produced an attractive portrait of an unusually interesting and neglected figure; but the measure of his achievement is not only the reassessment of the life and work of the subject of his biography, but the way in which he has related his narrative to the religious and political movements of the period in a well-written book.

J. F. BURNET

ALFRED NORTH WHITEHEAD: An Anthology, by F. S. Northrop & Mason W. Gross. *Cambridge University Press*. 75s.

DIALOGUES OF ALFRED NORTH WHITEHEAD, recorded by Lucien Price. *Little, Brown, Boston*. \$5.

Even those to whom Whitehead's *Process and Reality* suggests a metaphysical fairyland, in which actual entities and eternal objects, for instance, correspond to gnomes and sprites, can welcome this anthology. It presents, without an index, in extensive extracts from Whitehead's works, the progressive thought of an admittedly powerful thinker. Of his earlier works, mainly on mathematics and mathematical logic, only *On Mathematical Concepts of the Material World* is included. This, and *Religion in the Making* are reprinted completely; selected chapters represent the other included works.

Whitehead's philosophy involves him in a new terminology, and his readers in mental wrestles. Mason Gross ends the anthology with notes on this terminology—directing the reader to some relevant passages. Outside his own terminology Whitehead can be lucid and vigorous. He can be sweeping, as with "the mass of fables termed history" or "necessity is the mother of futile dodges" or in

calling "necessity is the mother of invention" a "silly proverb". He can flash out wisdom in: "Seek simplicity and distrust it." He can be portentously oracular, as in: "Thus tautology is the intellectual amusement of the Infinite."

Whitehead, in effect, warns those who study his philosophy or garner wit and wisdom from his pages. In the Preface to *Process and Reality* he repudiates trust in the adequacy of language to express thought. This refers specially to philosophy, but in the very readable and attractive "Dialogues" he insists on the imprecision of language and the inadequacy of words. He quite clearly affirms a widespread failure to realize the difficulty of verbal communication, the paleness of written statement compared with actual experience, and the inability of words to "express our deepest intuitions."

The transcript of the talks can be adequate, whatever the quality of the sayings. Lucien Price does not claim perfection for his record, but the methods used seem to have secured substantial accuracy. The recorded conversations range from April 6, 1934, to November 11, 1947, shortly before Whitehead died on December 30, 1947, in his 87th year. During this period he lived in America with one participant in the dialogues—his wife.

Lucien Price's sister, who typed the records, thought that "abstract ideas", difficult to understand in the "published works", are easily grasped as "they come out in casual conversation." She had found the dialogues attractive. Though, as Mr. Price thought and Whitehead confirmed, most of the matter in the talks does not occur in the books, the writer is perceptible in the speaker. A powerful predilection for Plato pervades both. The writer, in *Process and Reality*, affirms that every philosophy, in its turn, will be deposed; the speaker often insists on "the fallacy of dogmatic finality." When, perhaps strangely for a philosopher, Whitehead says: "Apart from beauty, truth is neither good nor bad" he echoes his written: "Truth matters

because of Beauty."

The demolition of "the Newtonian physics", Whitehead tells Lucien Price, taught him to "beware of certitude" and, further, of finality in "Einstein's relativity". This reveals the influence of a personal experience in his strictures on "finality of statement". Many such supplemental comments on his thought occur in the dialogues. He confesses, for instance, to "three distinct lives": from childhood to the first world war, from 1914 to 1924, and, after these, his life in America. The first seemed "the most fantastic", for between 1880 and 1914 various "ideas and institutions" looked too stable even to dream of their impermanence.

Whitehead advised Lucien Price to make clear that the records had been "read by us" and approved, for, otherwise, they might not be credited. His addendum, "I wouldn't have believed it myself," along with his "we live perforce by half-truths," should perhaps be applied to his many challenging statements—when, for instance, he equates the "idea of God" held by Paul and his followers with "the idea of the devil." Many passages can be picked from the dialogues to stir thoughts round.

"The doctrine here developed . . . is entirely neutral on the question of immortality": so runs a passage from *Religion in the Making*. God is continually creative in the world. Since man's participation in the creative process is his immortality, his survival after death is irrelevant: so the sayings of Alfred North Whitehead end.

JOSHUA C. GREGORY

COCTEAU ON THE FILM; a conversation recorded by André Fraigneau. *Dobson*. 12s. 6d.

COMEDY FILMS, by John Montgomery. *Allen & Unwin*. 21s.

By most of the protagonists in Mr. Montgomery's book, Jean Cocteau would certainly be regarded as an esoteric, somewhat awful figure. It is piquant therefore to learn from his conversation with André Fraigneau that

he made his first essay in film with a vanished *jeu d'esprit* that was to have been called "*Jean Cocteau fait du cinema* in the style of Chaplin's films of that period, *Charlot patine*, etc."

The industry does well to be wary of extraordinary individuals who insist on using the most unwieldy and commercialized of mass-arts for their private poem-making; and the varying fates of a Chaplin, an Eisenstein, a Welles, seem Promethean penalties for temerity. Jean Cocteau among these few has so perfectly succeeded in preserving inviolate his secretive talent that it is almost beside the point to add that most of his films have been tantalizing and minor; but the fashionable *Orphée*, which draws addicts again and again, has kept its spell, and *Les Parents Terribles*, transcript of a three-act domestic drama, had in the event a wit and splendour truly cinematic. ("I showed the thunder-laden corridors which had haunted my childhood, and which are the streets of families that never go out.")

His aphorisms are as much on the artistic process itself, as on its application to film-making. Always fascinating, they are as often mysterious as revealing. ("One should say 'expiration' not 'inspiration'. It is from our reserves, from our night that things come to us. Our work pre-exists within us. The problem is to discover it. We are merely its archaeologists.") If the resulting poem is to be a film a group of people have to work at enormous pressure to realize the poet's vision. This, Jean Cocteau maintains, is only possible under the freer conditions in French studios where "film-making is a family affair and no one rebels if his prerogatives are encroached upon." Evidently this artist has a genius for attracting devoted collaborators and he is generous in their praise: Christian Bérard, camera-men, the actresses—Maria Casarès, doomed and fabulously smart in *Orphée*, Yvonne de Bray as the terrible mother, "a lioness in a cage." One wishes that Jean Cocteau, of all film-makers, might be the one to lure

Greta Garbo back to the screen.

Then he is a classicist in love with disorder, and in the special disorders of film-making he finds great stimulus. The most interesting pages to technicians describe the magical effects in *Orphée*. They were obtained by a beautiful blending of imagination, ingenuity and opportunism. It is easy to see the appeal for him of incongruous or (most elegant) accidentally synchronizing musical accompaniment—immediately the action can appear to take place on different levels. And it is in the space between them that the poet can deploy his "dreams" to move in, conquer and become ours. Sometimes he will speak in the very tone with which Mr. Eliot rebuffs the more busily symbol-seeking of his followers. Thus, of the Princess who makes so portentous an exit from *Orphée*: "What is the punishment to which she exposes herself? This is beyond me and doesn't concern me any more than do the rites of the bee-hive or of the ant's nest . . ."

Anyone who ever felt that *Les Parents Terribles* was on the point of becoming the funniest picture ever made will search for it in vain in Mr. Montgomery's work. He has in "a factual and not a critical account of the history and traditions of the comic film . . . concentrated mainly on American and British films and players." The earlier chapters on the Keystone cops era are lively and informative. A true devotee of slapstick, he has never become reconciled to the passing of silence. His account of later developments suffers from some lack of proportion, and though the voice is an enthusiast's the language is too often that of the publicity hand-out. He recalls in inexorable detail a great number of lugubrious early talkies from British studios, but seems to have an imperfect sympathy for the beautifully scripted and edited comedies of the Hollywood '30's. The Jean Harlow of *Blonde Bombshell* is not mentioned; nor are the short films of Robert Benchley (who appears in the index as Benckley, a characteristic mis-

hap surely). Yet at the same time we are tormented by reminders of *Elstree Calling* and *Banana Ridge*.

G. W. HORNER

THE BIRTH OF VENUS, by John Smith. *Hutchinson*. 7s. 6d.

THE CHARM AGAINST THE TOOTHACHE, by John Heath-Stubbs. *Methuen*. 7s.

PHOENIX AND UNICORN, Poems by Beram Saklatvala. *Fortune Press*. 6s.

When in 1952 Mr. John Smith published his second collection of poems, *The Dark Side of Love*, there was seen to be a new poet in process of emerging. Everything was there in embryo. The tentative reaching after form, the experiments in technics, the — often sombre—surge of language, the feeling for the music beneath metre; all these were clearly working through the mind and imagination of a true poet. At the centre, however, there was an immaturity. The vision was unsteady, uncertain and sometimes hidden by cotton-wool. This poetry seemed to need a deeper experience of life, fully to catch alight. At moments, indeed, it did so flame, and those were the points at which the critic decided to watch this poet's development.

The present collection shows the deepening, the maturing, of a boy's poetry into a man's. Vision has both intensified and clarified. And with the mastery of technique, the subservience to his intention and control, of image, symbol and sound, the complex ideas are communicated with a rare clarity. To some extent it can be seen in the still immature brilliance of "God's Envy", but much more so in some of the longer poems, notably in "Snow: A Meditation", which has been awarded the first Adam International Review poetry prize. It is the reverie of a poet as he looks out from his room, "heady with books", to "A world I have known, obliterated, cancelled," under the snow, and it discovers

to the reader glimpses of those further dimensions of existence—beyond what passes for normality—which are the poet's province.

But most of all, the development is shown in the long sequence, "Lazarus". This is significant, since—as is, of course, usual in early work—it was in the attempts at sustained writing in the previous book that the thinness showed. The imaginative reach of this poem is impressive. To delve into the spiritual conflict of the grave-bound Lazarus, caught between life and death, and to render the whole experience in a poetry which expands the reader's consciousness, this is the business of the poet, and it is here achieved. The power is sustained throughout. Nowhere does it sag or slacken. Indeed, it gathers force steadily. The occasional affectation or carelessness or facileness still to be found in Mr. Smith's work has little place in this ambitious poem.

Among the shorter pieces, "The Birth of Venus" has a gay and growing enchantment as it settles into the memory. Distinguished also is the delicately conceived and wrought lament for Sidney Keyes, and there is a most moving homage to the poet's mother. It is no service to a young poet to overpraise him, but sober thought convinces that there is great potentiality here.

Many of Mr. Heath-Stubbs's poems are, as ever, heavy with erudition, which often drags at the heels of his ideas. In the present volume, however, there are some poems—in particular the beautiful "Canticle of the Sun" and "Churchyard of St. Mary Magdalene, Old Milton", in which he beseeches the saint to

Carry these lives, these parts of lives,
these yellow leaves . . .
On tides of intercession, down
to where
. . . the free gull tacks to the courteous
southern stars,
With arched and frost-pale pinion:
Oh, in Death's garden be
Prime witness of the Resurrection
which by-pass this tendency and go
straight to the heart of the matter.

That a poet who can write "Church-

yard of St. Mary Magdalene" can be content with such an exercise as "The Hundred and thirty-seventh Psalm Paraphrased" seems extraordinary. Why take the profound merely to render it trivial? There are, however, some satirical exercises which are more

amusing. Mr. Heath-Stubbs is, of course, an accomplished poet. He could become much more than this.

Phoenix and Unicorn is an attractive book of minor verse, graceful and occasionally elegant.

LOVEDAY MARTIN

BOOKS ON THE TABLE

Were there really two stranglers—Timothy Evans and John Christie—separately tenanting the same house in Notting Hill; and would Doreen Marshall still have met her death at Bournemouth if the photograph of Neville Heath had been published when he disappeared after murdering Margery Gardner in London? Such questions as these the public and the compilers of 'famous trials' will continue to ask...

Inside the Yard

But for the Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police from 1945 to 1953, there is a calm certainty at any rate that Evans was justly hanged and that the decision not to show Heath's face—so striking a one moreover—to newspaper readers was right. In subordinating the sensational in crime to illustrate police methods of detection, Sir Harold Scott's handling—neither kid-gloved nor bare-knuckled—is exemplary for his soberly factual *SCOTLAND YARD* (*André Deutsch*. 16s.). How our 'wonderful' men-on-the-beat are made; the organization of the criminal record office, the fingerprint department, and the forensic science laboratory; the ramifications of the C.I.D.; the training of the flying and fraud squads, of the mounted section and of the dogs—these are some of the activities of absorbing interest he covers. Then the wry story of the departure and return of Westminster Abbey's stone of Scone becomes no less astonishing in the telling here. And the "creeping paralysis" of London's traffic is discussed, and the intricacies

of the arrangements for special occasions are described, whether our own coronation or a Marshal Tito visit (for the second, no bullet-proof car was available in England but the Government of Northern Ireland was able to supply one!). Nor during the last 30 years is the coming of woman, with equal powers of arrest and training in self-defence, causing any break in the force's tradition of public service, which is the keynote of this gratitude-creating book. Its only cause for scolding seems to be an haphazard distribution of the illustrations; for examples, Sir Harold bestrides his horse, both caparisoned for June 2, 1953, in the chapter called "The Women Police", and the smiling, handcuffed Haigh, who undetected had disposed of at least five other victims, accompanies "The Police, the Press, the Public".

The lively oracles of God

The reproductions are most strategically placed in *THE BIBLE: Historical, Social, and Literary Aspects of the Old and New Testaments*, described by Christian scholars (*The Times Supplement*. 1s.). If these 29 essays and this unhackneyed horde of pictures had been gathered into a volume, nobody would have been surprised if it had cost another pound. Unhappily the shillings-worth often escapes the eye that alights on the guineasworth (as all who receive pamphlets, if they are honest, will attest). But this supplement, more than large enough to be seen, should

also attract all, and not necessarily Christians, who agree "that waning familiarity with the Bible spells the loss of precious values." The student of archaeology, or of languages, or of music, should find stimulus to curiosity in its pages; and from the reconstruction of Nebuchadnezzar's Babylon to Millais' sketch of Scottish psalmody a century ago, the illustrations are of a sort to be pored over.

Making straight a highway

John Jaynes Holmes who studies comparative religions and occupies an American pulpit has written "a personal portrait of a man who shook the world" in *MY GANDHI* (George Allen & Unwin. 10s. 6d.). The subheading thus disarms any distaste for the complacent, the proprietary, or the downright impudent that might be heard sounding through the title. And truly so, for here is the humble testimony of one who saw that nobody but God possessed Gandhi, and that Gandhi it was who always possessed lesser men. Already in 1921 Dr. Holmes found himself proclaiming him to be "the greatest man in the world" and when the two men met ten years later for the first time, this belief was only strengthened as he sat at the feet of saint and seer. He says his own life as a teacher began with Gandhi, and, that it did not really end with Gandhi's end, this book is a burning attestation. Although "too much of his activity was poured out, like water upon the ground, on economics and politics" the fact that here was one who really believed that you should love your enemies has crowned him with lasting glory. He died in fact—as Bernard Shaw has said somewhere and differently—"only to live more amply in the hearts of men."

Good citizenship

An agnostic, whose last few years saw her concerned at intervals with "philosophic and religious interpreta-

tions of existence" as one result of a life of devotion in the service to the community, is the subject of a loving daughter's discriminating biography, *FAMILY INHERITANCE* (Staples 10s. 6d.) by Diana Hopkinson. As Viscount Samuel says in the Foreword, Eva Hubback "belonged to the first generation of women for whom the doors were open wide. Her distinction is that, being born also of a family in easy circumstances, intelligent and public-spirited, and herself endowed with brains, health and energy, she seized her opportunities with both hands." They led her to become Principal of Morley College where all her talent for organization and constructive effort could be employed. And the book contains a fruitful chapter which sets forth the aims of this institution for the promotion of educational opportunities for the working classes.

But social reform in all its aspects, and especially where it concerned women and children, was her province, and only a week before her death in 1949 she pleaded in a letter to *The Times* for an intensive child care service which would benefit neglected children without removing them from their homes: "The responsibility for these children is too great to be left to any voluntary organization," she wrote, feeling that it should be placed "squarely on the shoulders of local authorities." She did not live to see accomplished this enlargement of the definition of the phrase "in need of care and protection." Her ideas on education for citizenship began in her immediate circle and extended to all humanity. Her personality, shining through her social work, has become much more than a "family inheritance". Nevertheless, one likes especially the account of her lecturing on population in the garden of Grantley Hall, where her son-in-law is Warden, with her arm absentmindedly around a four-year-old grandchild who had strayed upon the scene.

GRACE BANYARD